

## SENATE—Thursday, March 3, 1994

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 22, 1994)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As we make our supplications and give praises to Almighty God, who created man in His own image and breathed into His nostrils the breath of life, the Senate will be led by its Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Dr. Halverson.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer: Let us pray.

\* \* \* *thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*—Matthew 22:37–40.

Gracious God of truth and love and mercy, these words are precise and unambiguous, but we do not seem to take them seriously. Paul, the apostle, declared that "love is the fulfilling of the law." The apostle John wrote, "He that does not love does not know God; for God is love." Hearing these explicit words, we remember with shame the history of religious wars, and the consummate tragedy that today religion is fracturing nations.

God of perfection, awaken us to the realization that failure to love makes a travesty of religion and exposes our ignorance of God. Help us understand that love is more than a sentimental feeling, love is volitional, requiring a decision to obey God and love, not only our neighbor, but our enemy.

In His name who is love incarnate. Amen.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] to be recognized to speak for up to 30 minutes; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] will be permitted to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes; and then the Sen-

ator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] will control 10 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, Mr. President.

## CONFUSING THE HEALTH CARE ISSUE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I have been asked in recent days about polls published in a number of newspapers showing some slippage in the support for the health plan proposed by this administration.

My answer to the queries that I have had is, I am not really surprised. After an orchestrated campaign, the cost of which has been more than \$10 million, by many opponents of health reform, especially those outside of Washington—the insurance industry, lobbyists, and others—I am not surprised.

The American people are confused with the tremendous amount of misinformation that has characterized so much of the debate so far. There has been an orchestrated effort to mislead the people and I think, to a certain extent, as it pertains to the Clinton health plan, they have succeeded.

But I am also convinced that these poll numbers are temporary. What is permanent is a desire on the part of the American people to solve the health care crisis.

Because, in spite of the ups and downs of polls relating directly to this plan, 86 percent of the American people, in virtually every poll from the very beginning, want guaranteed private health insurance for all Americans. In spite of the ups and downs on the Clinton health plan, 67 percent of all the American people want the responsibility for paying for it to be shared between employer and employees alike. And in spite of the ups and downs, Mr. President, over 60 percent of the American people say again and again that they want a specified list of comprehensive benefits so they know what they are getting.

Those numbers do not appear to change at all. Regardless of all the talk of alliances and specific proposals, the core feeling of the American people is as strong today as it was at the very beginning. That does not change.

I hope there is something else that does not change. I hope that there is a sincere desire on the part of our Repub-

lican colleagues not to politicize this issue. I believe that there are many on the other side who want health reform as badly as those on this side of the aisle. I am encouraged by their determination in much of what I see in the Finance Committee on a daily basis—good questions, good statements, persistence on the part of so many who have been with this issue for so long.

But I must say this morning, Mr. President, I am encouraged, as well as concerned, about this Republican retreat that will begin tonight. I am encouraged because there are a large number of Republican Senators who certainly want to devote the attention necessary to an issue of this magnitude and have demonstrated it. Our colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] is the one who called for this retreat. So I know in his mind there is a lot that can be done in another opportunity to look very closely at an issue of this magnitude.

But I am concerned that some in the Republican caucus want to do to health what they did to deficit reduction. They want to politicize it.

I have concluded, having been around here for almost 7 years now, that each and every time this body politicizes an issue, we lose. It is that simple. To politicize health would mean that Republicans lose. To politicize health would mean Democrats lose. But, most importantly, to politicize this issue means the American people lose.

Instead of coming out swinging, my sincere hope this morning, the morning of the retreat tonight, is that our Republican colleagues will come out extending—extending their arms in a real effort at bipartisanship to resolve these problems that we all know exist.

That has been the approach this administration has used from the very beginning. In scores of meetings here and down there one-on-one with the President himself, with the First Lady, with every Member of the Cabinet, in small groups and in big groups, I do not think I have ever seen a more inclusive effort ever undertaken by any administration. Inclusion has been the approach that this administration has used. I hope that it is reciprocated as Republicans and Democrats attempt, in as sincere a way as possible, to deal with this issue effectively.

I hope, Mr. President, that my concerns are unwarranted. I hope the announcement tomorrow afternoon will be that the Republican caucus is even more determined than ever to come up with a plan to work together. I hope

that all Senators can come to the same conclusion which many of us have—that the less we do, the more costly the effect. That is counterintuitive, but it is true—the less we do, the more costly the effect.

Every single serious analytical effort that has been presented to us thus far has demonstrated that. And of all the alternatives, they tell us, one by one, as recently as this week, the status quo is the most expensive. Every analysis done so far has indicated that we have to do something to stem this incredible flow of cost into health. We all have been told, time and time again virtually every time we get into a budget debate about the implications of health on our budget, and the President pro tempore knows that better than any one of us in this Chamber—in fact the Congressional Budget Office said that—unless we deal with health care we cannot contain our budget problems.

As they reported to Congress just a couple of weeks ago, it is the Clinton plan that reduces costs to health, and to the budget, by \$237 billion over a 10-year period of time. They reported to us just a couple of weeks ago that the Clinton plan saves business \$90 billion a year, when it is fully implemented. And just this week the Department of Health and Human Services released their analysis of the effect that the Clinton plan would have, not only on our budget but on all the budgets, State by State. Their report was very encouraging.

They indicated that States could save \$39 billion in Medicaid costs alone

between the years 1996 and 2000; that they would save \$6.3 billion a year at the end of the decade just as an employer. That is per year, by the end of the decade.

Health and Human Services say business, too, are big winners, saving more than \$59 billion a year, that comes out to \$605 a worker. And working families would save \$29 billion a year, \$293 per worker.

That is the kind of analytical information many of us asserted all along ought to drive this debate. We can truly provide the universal coverage, this guaranteed access to private insurance that we want for all Americans, at the same time we reduce costs.

It is such a remarkable study I would like to share it with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Feb. 28, 1994]

#### IMPACT OF THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT ON STATES

##### I. SUMMARY, IMPACT OF THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT ON STATES

The Health Security Act will reduce the cost of insurance in states through universal coverage, cost containment, and the elimination of cost shifting.

Employers who currently offer insurance will save on average of \$605 per worker (1.6% of payroll or \$59.5 billion on total) on premiums in the year 2000.

Workers who are in firms that currently offer health insurance will save an average of \$293 per worker (\$29.9 billion in total) on premiums in the year 2000.

As a purchaser of health care coverage for their employees, states will save approximately \$5.6 billion in premium payments for active employees in the year 2000 due to slower growth in overall health care costs. Additionally, states will save an estimated \$704 million through federal support of health care for early state retirees in the year 2000.

State expenditures for Medicaid and community-based long-term care are projected to decrease in the aggregate under the Health Security Act.

Between 1996 and the year 2000, states will save an estimated \$43.6 billion in state Medicaid expenditures under the Health Security Act; an estimated \$31.9 billion represents coverage of Medicaid recipients through regional alliances, and approximately \$11.7 billion will be saved through the new community-based long-term care program. In the year 2000, state Medicaid programs will save approximately \$22.3 billion—\$3.3 billion results from the new home and community-based long-term care program.

When taking new state spending for the new community-based long-term care program into account, states will save, on net, nearly \$7.6 billion on community-based long-term care expenditures between 1996 and 2000 under the Health Security Act. In the year 2000 alone, states will save \$1.1 billion on community-based long-term care.

States will save \$39.5 billion between 1996 and 2000 under the Health Security Act, \$7.6 billion from the community-based long-term care program, and \$31.9 billion from the remaining changes in the Medicaid program. In the year 2000, this represents \$20.1 billion, \$19.0 billion in Medicaid savings excluding home and community-based care and \$1.1 billion in savings from the home and community-based care program.

#### IMPACT OF THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT ON STATES: YEAR 2000

Expenditure categories	Without reform	Reform	Savings
<b>PURCHASING HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT</b>			
Employers' share of the premiums:			
Total employer premium payments—all firms	\$303.5 billion	\$275.5 billion	\$28.0 billion
Total employer premium payments—employers currently offering insurance	\$303.5 billion	\$243.9 billion	\$59.5 billion
Premium payments as a percent of payroll—employers currently offering insurance	8.2%	6.6%	1.6%
Premium payments per worker—employers currently offering insurance	\$3,086 per worker (\$257/month)	\$2,481 per worker (\$207/month)	\$605 per worker (\$50/month)
Families' and individuals' share of the premiums:			
Total worker premium payments—all firms	\$73.6 billion	\$53.7 billion	\$19.9 billion
Total worker premium payments—workers in firms currently offering insurance	\$73.6 billion	\$44.7 billion	\$28.9 billion
Worker premiums—workers in firms currently offering insurance	\$748 per worker (\$62/month)	\$455 per worker (\$38/month)	\$293 per worker (\$24/month)
New Federal funds for discounts <sup>1</sup>			
State expenditures on active State employees	\$15.8 billion	\$10.2 billion	\$5.6 billion
State expenditures on early State retirees	\$1.3 billion	\$0.6 billion	\$0.7 billion
<b>MEDICAID</b>			
State Medicaid expenditures, including savings from community-based long-term care	\$123.3 billion	\$101.0 billion	\$22.3 billion
State Medicaid expenditures, not including savings from community-based long-term care	\$123.3 billion	\$104.3 billion	\$19.0 billion
<b>NEW LONG-TERM CARE PROGRAM</b>			
State community-based long-term care expenditures	\$9.9 billion	\$8.9 billion	\$1.1 billion

<sup>1</sup> Total discounts minus states' maintenance of effort

NOTE: For display purposes only, the Medicaid savings due to the new community-based long-term care program are shown under both the Medicaid and the New Long-Term Program sections. "State Community-Based Long-Term Care Expenditures" also reflects changes in state-only spending for the severely disabled and state funds directed toward the new long-term care program. Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding.

#### II. HEALTH SECURITY ACT: MAJOR POLICY CHANGES AFFECTING STATES

The following is a brief description of some of the major policy changes under the Health Security Act that affect state expenditures.\*

Footnotes at end of article.

#### Universal coverage and cost containment under the Health Security Act

The Health Security Act guarantees all American citizens and legal residents private insurance coverage for a comprehensive package of benefits. Coverage continues with no lifetime limits regardless of a change of

employer, employment status, marital status or medical condition.

The Health Security Act relies on the requirement of shared responsibility for the purchase of health coverage. It strengthens the private, employment-based system and augments it with a commitment to make the

purchase of coverage affordable through discounts to small business and families.

The Health Security Act carries out the commitment to control the rising costs of health care by:

(1) Consolidating the purchasing power of consumers so that private payers in a competitive market can slow the growth of health insurance premiums. This process is backed up by a cap on the growth of insurance premiums.

(2) Reducing the rate of growth of the Medicare and Medicaid programs without reducing benefits or quality of care.

#### *Premiums under the Health Security Act*

Under the Health Security Act, health coverage is purchased in two shares: the individual or family share and the employer share. Each individual or family purchases a health plan designed to cover one of four categories by family type:

- (1) A single adult policy;
- (2) A policy covering two adults;
- (3) A policy covering a single parent with children; or
- (4) A policy covering two parents with children.

#### *Employers' share of the premiums*

Generally, employers pay 80 percent of the weighted average premium calculated on a per worker basis within a regional alliance for the appropriate family type policy.\*\* Additionally, an employer may choose to pay part or all of the family share of the premium.

Employers' premium payments within regional alliances are capped. At full implementation, employers purchasing coverage through regional alliances will pay no more than 7.9 percent of payroll for health coverage for their workers. Businesses with fewer than 75 workers receive discounts that cap their payments to a sliding scale (3.5% to 7.9% of payroll) based on size and average wage.

#### *Families' and individuals' share of the premiums*

The family or individual pays the difference between the employer share and the actual premium of the health plan in which they choose to enroll. Those who choose to enroll in a lower-cost plan will pay lower premiums than those who choose higher-cost plans.

For families and individuals, as well as employers, premium payments are capped. Families with an annual income of \$40,000 or less pay no more than 3.9 percent of their income toward their share of the premium. Those with incomes below 150 percent of poverty receive discounts toward their share of the premium.

#### *Medicaid under the Health Security Act*

Under the Health Security Act, Medicaid recipients under the age of 65 enter the alliance system to obtain the guaranteed comprehensive benefit package.

People not on cash assistance who now receive Medicaid choose their health plan and may qualify for discounts based on income, like other eligible individuals and families. States contribute toward discounts for their residents by maintaining current Medicaid spending efforts for this population.

Individuals who qualify for cash assistance (Aid to Families with Dependent Children or Supplemental Security Income) also choose their own health plans through regional alliances. The federal and state governments make premium payments for these individuals based on current state and federal Medicaid expenditures.

For low-income children under the age of 19, a new program is created to provide services currently offered under Medicaid but not included in the comprehensive benefits package, such as hearing aids and non-emergency transportation. States maintain current spending for children receiving cash assistance.

State expenditures on Medicaid will decrease under the Health Security Act for several reasons:

Coverage of current cash eligible Medicaid recipients through regional alliances: Acute care spending for cash eligible Medicaid recipients decreases because of their inclusion in regional alliances, where costs will not grow as rapidly as under the current system. States pay a premium for these services that is based on 95 percent of current expenditures for this population. In addition to this reduction in expenditures, states no longer make disproportionate share payments for their cash-eligible populations.

Coverage of current non-cash eligible Medicaid recipients through regional alliances and the new program for children's supplemental services: Expenditures for non-cash eligible Medicaid recipients, like those for cash eligibles, are reduced due to their inclusion in regional alliances. Although the states make maintenance of effort (MOE) payments based on current expenditures for acute care services and disproportionate share for this population, these payments will not grow as rapidly as under the current system. Additionally, the federal government assumes the costs of supplemental services for Medicaid eligible children. Because the MOE payments for cash eligible children's supplemental services will grow at a slower rate than do current expenditures for these services, states achieve savings.

#### *New long-term care program under the Health Security Act*

The Health Security Act creates a new home and community-based long-term care program for individuals with severe disabilities regardless of income or age. The program is financed by:

Federal Government: New federal funds are allotted to states based on a formula that includes the number of persons with severe disabilities among other factors. Additionally, current federal Medicaid expenditures for these services for the severely disabled will be used to fund the new program to the extent that current Medicaid eligibles are served in the program. The federal share of public costs ranges from 78 to 95 percent when fully phased in.

States: State spending for the new program will be matched by the federal government at a rate substantially higher than that of the current Medicaid program. Part of the state funds will come from the transfer of Medicaid expenditures for community-based long-term care for the severely disabled. At the most, states will pay between 5 and 22 percent of the public program costs.

Individuals: Participants whose income is greater than 150 percent of the federal poverty level will contribute based on their income.

States have the flexibility to organize services to meet their populations' diverse needs; at a minimum, states must provide personal assistance to eligible individuals needing assistance with activities of daily living. States have the option to continue to provide community-based long-term care services under the state Medicaid program.

#### *Public health initiatives under the Health Security Act*

The Public Health Initiatives under the Health Security Act will provide states and

communities with new funds to create partnerships among government, alliances, health care providers, and communities that will:

Enhance the capability of communities to protect the health of their populations and to address high-priority local health problems;

Increase the number of minorities in health professions, support graduate nurse training initiatives, and expand training projects for primary care physicians and physician assistants;

Assure access to essential health services for all Americans, particularly low-income, isolated, hard-to-reach populations; and

Provide the knowledge and information systems necessary to prevent disease and provide medical care more appropriately and efficiently.

Due to universal coverage under the Health Security Act, most personal health services now provided the Public Health Service will be paid for by insurance.

#### *III. BACKGROUND: STATES AND HEALTH REFORM*

Over the past decade, state governments, residents, and employers have faced rapid increases in the already high health care costs.

Between 1980 and 1991, spending in states for hospital care, physician services, and prescription drug purchases in retail outlets rose at an average annual rate of 10.5 percent.<sup>1</sup>

In 1993, states spent more on health care than on tax-financed higher education.<sup>2</sup>

Between 1988 and 1990, the average annual growth in Medicaid expenditures was 15.7 percent,<sup>3</sup> and it is expected that state Medicaid spending will nearly triple between 1990 and 1995.<sup>4</sup>

United States—Health care environment	Statistics
Percentage of population covered by Medicaid (1991) <sup>5</sup>	10.6%
Medicaid payments per recipient (1992) <sup>6</sup>	\$2,937
Average annual growth in Medicaid expenditures (1988–1990) <sup>3</sup>	15.7%
Infant mortality rate per 1000 live births (1991) <sup>7</sup>	8.9

Footnotes at end of article.

States have taken several steps to control the rise in health care costs and to increase access to health care for its residents.<sup>8, 9</sup>

Almost all states have initiated or enacted measures to improve access and contain costs.<sup>8</sup>

Fourteen states have enacted or proposed legislation designed to provide universal coverage for all state residents.<sup>8</sup>

Twelve states have enacted or proposed legislation designed to contain costs through managed competition or purchasing pools.<sup>8</sup>

Forty-seven states have enacted or proposed small group insurance reform; eighteen states have enacted or proposed insurance reform for individuals.<sup>8</sup>

Examples of state health reform initiatives include:

Expanding access to health care for targeted population groups, such as pregnant women or children, through public sector, private sector, or a mixture of both, interventions. This often includes expanding Medicaid eligibility for coverage and services beyond Medicaid's traditional income restrictions.<sup>8</sup>

Small group and individual market reforms including guaranteed issue and renewal, limits on pre-existing condition exclusions, rating restrictions and benefit mandates.<sup>8</sup>

Containing costs through the use of managed competition or purchasing pools, provider rate setting, insurer premium caps, and global budgets.<sup>8</sup>

Acting alone, states are hampered in their efforts to control the growth of health care

costs. The Health Security Act will enable states to control the growth of health care expenditures and assure access to care for its residents.

Universal coverage, achieved through a federal/state partnership, will reduce the burden on state and municipal programs and providers that today help finance and deliver services to the uninsured and under-insured.

Federal grants will help states provide special assistance to underserved rural and urban areas. States will be able to strengthen and improve essential public health efforts.

The Health Security Act will control the increase in health care costs by introducing greater competition into the health care delivery system.

#### IV. IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR<sup>10</sup>

##### A. Premium payments under the Health Security Act

###### Total Annual Premium Payments: Year 2000

Without reform, employers who currently offer insurance would pay an estimated total of \$303.5 billion in premiums in the year 2000. Under the Health Security Act, all firms, including those that do not currently offer insurance, will pay \$275.5 billion in premium payments for their employees. Firms that currently offer insurance to their employees will pay an estimated total of \$243.9 billion in premium payments—\$59.5 billion less than they would pay without comprehensive reform.

Workers who currently work in firms that offer insurance would pay an estimated total of \$73.6 billion in premium payments in the year 2000 without comprehensive reform. Under the Health Security Act, workers, including those who are not currently covered through firms offering insurance, will pay a total of \$53.7 billion in premiums in the year 2000. Employees in firms that currently offer insurance will pay an estimated total of \$44.7

billion in premiums in the year 2000, almost \$29 billion less than they would without comprehensive reform.

##### Employer Premium Payments as a Percent of Payroll: Year 2000

The Health Security Act will reduce the percent of payroll that employers who currently offer health insurance will spend on premiums from 8.2 percent to 6.6 percent, a reduction of approximately 20 percent due to reforms in the Act.

In the year 2000, all employers will spend an average of 6.4 percent of their payroll on premiums under the Health Security Act.

##### Average Annual Premium Payments per Worker: Year 2000

For all employers, the average premium payment per worker will be an estimated \$2,245 in the year 2000 under the Health Security Act. Employers that currently offer health insurance will pay an estimated \$2,481 in premium payments for workers—\$605 less than they would pay if there were no comprehensive reform.

Under the Health Security Act, workers will pay an average premium share of approximately \$437 in the year 2000. Employees in firms that currently offer insurance will pay on average \$455. This is an estimated \$293 less than they would pay in premiums if there were no comprehensive reform. Savings will be even greater for those workers who currently purchase health insurance directly from insurance companies.

##### B. Discounts under the Health Security Act—Year 2000

Qualified small and low-wage employers, low-income families, and early retirees will receive an estimated total of \$104 billion in the year 2000 for premium and out-of-pocket payment discounts under the Health Security Act.

States' residents and businesses will receive an estimated \$81 billion in federal funds for discounts in the year 2000.

The approximately \$23 billion remaining will come from state funds, a substitute for the \$27.8 billion that states would have paid for services for non-cash Medicaid recipients without reform.

#### V. IMPACT ON THE PUBLIC SECTOR

##### A. States as employers under the Health Security Act—Year 2000

As purchasers of health care coverage for their employees, states will benefit from slower growth in overall health care costs.

Federal support of health care for early retirees will produce large savings for state employee health benefits programs. Under the Health Security Act, the federal government will cover the 80 percent employer share of the early state retirees' premiums. The state will assume the 20 percent family share.

States will spend an estimated \$10.2 billion on their active employee health benefits in the year 2000 under the Health Security Act. This represents an estimated savings of \$5.6 billion when compared to the estimated spending without reform of \$15.8 billion in the year 2000.

States as employers will save an estimated \$704 million on its premium spending for retirees between the ages of 55 and 64 years in the year 2000.

##### B. State Medicaid spending under the Health Security Act

###### Medicaid Growth: 1996-2000<sup>11</sup>

Under the Health Security Act, states save approximately \$43.6 billion between the years 1996 and 2000. These savings will result primarily from the inclusion of Medicaid recipients in regional alliances, where health care costs will not grow as rapidly as in the current system.

#### MEDICAID EXPENDITURES: 1996-2000<sup>1</sup>

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1998	Fiscal year 1999	Fiscal year 2000	Total
Medicaid spending without reform	77.6	87.3	98.0	109.9	123.3	496.0
Health Security Act spending	76.8	85.1	94.1	95.4	101.0	452.3
Acute care Medicaid	47.9	49.3	44.0	38.1	39.3	218.6
Long-term care Medicaid	27.0	29.3	32.0	34.9	38.2	161.3
Maintenance of effort	2.0	6.5	18.1	22.4	23.4	72.4
Change in State Medicaid spending	(0.8)	(2.2)	(3.9)	(14.5)	(22.3)	(43.6)
Change in State Medicaid spending less community-based long-term care savings	0.5	(0.2)	(1.5)	(11.6)	(19.0)	(31.9)

<sup>1</sup> Estimates of the impact of the Health Security Act on all States assumes that States implement reform in January of 1996, 1997, or 1998, as specified in the act.

Overall, states will save an estimated \$43.6 billion on Medicaid expenditures between 1996 and 2000 under the Health Security Act. An estimated \$31.9 billion in savings results from coverage of Medicaid recipients through the regional alliances and other policy changes under the Health Security Act. The remaining \$11.7 billion in Medicaid savings results from the new community-based long-term care program.<sup>12</sup>

Medicaid spending on acute care, which includes premium payments for cash assistance recipients and wrap-around services for adults, will be an estimated \$39.3 billion in the year 2000. This will be lower than the acute care spending under the current system because of slower growth of health care costs under the Health Security Act.

Medicaid spending on long-term care under the Health Security Act will be approximately \$38.2 billion in the year 2000. This in-

cludes coverage of institutional long-term care and continuing Medicaid community-based long-term care.

States will contribute an estimated \$23.4 billion in the year 2000 in maintenance of effort payments that will be used for discounts for their low-income residents and small businesses.

##### C. New Long-Term Care Program Under the Health Security Act

#### STATE EXPENDITURES FOR COMMUNITY-BASED LONG-TERM CARE: 1996-2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1998	Fiscal year 1999	Fiscal year 2000	Total
Spending without reform	5,199	7,694	8,314	9,208	9,949	40,363
State Medicaid spending <sup>1</sup>	3,893	5,856	6,359	7,154	7,819	31,081
State-only spending on severely disabled <sup>2</sup>	1,306	1,838	1,955	2,054	2,130	9,283
Health Security Act spending	3,764	5,786	6,601	7,756	8,870	32,776

## STATE EXPENDITURES FOR COMMUNITY-BASED LONG-TERM CARE: 1996–2000—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1998	Fiscal year 1999	Fiscal year 2000	Total
New program spending: <sup>1</sup>						
State spending to match new Federal funds	869	1,504	2,106	2,804	3,551	10,835
State spending to match Medicaid transfer	276	446	540	645	737	2,644
State spending on continuing Medicaid	2,618	3,836	3,954	4,306	4,581	19,297
Change in State spending on community-based long-term care	(1,436)	(1,907)	(1,713)	(1,452)	(1,079)	(7,588)

<sup>1</sup> Projected Medicaid spending for home health, home and community-based waivers, personal care, frail elderly, and community-supported living arrangements (CSLA).<sup>2</sup> Includes estimated spending for persons who are likely to meet the eligibility criteria for the new program.<sup>3</sup> Assumes full state participation in the new program. The new program is not fully implemented until FY 2003. These net savings include some of the Medicaid program savings presented in Section B (State Medicaid Spending). The Medicaid offset estimate reflects more recent data than were available at the time that the FY 1995 Budget was prepared. Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Source: ASPE.

States will save an estimated \$7.6 billion on community-based long-term care spending under the Health Security Act between 1996 and 2000, \$1.1 billion in the year 2000 alone.

Without comprehensive reform, states would spend an estimated \$9.9 billion in Medicaid and non-Medicaid (state-only) funds on home health, personal health care services, and home and community-based waivers in the year 2000.

Under the Health Security Act, federal expenditures for community-based long-term care have two sources: new federal funds and Medicaid offset amounts. States will spend an estimated \$3.6 billion in the year 2000 to match new federal funds appropriated for the new program. Additionally, states will spend approximately \$737 million to match Medicaid offset amounts.

States will spend an estimated \$4.6 billion in the year 2000 for community-based serv-

ices that continue to be offered through Medicaid.

Total savings for states from Medicaid policy changes (\$31.9 billion) and the new community-based long-term care program (\$7.6 billion) will be an estimated \$39.5 billion between 1996 and 2000.<sup>13</sup>

## FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR COMMUNITY-BASED LONG-TERM CARE FOR STATES: 1996–2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1998	Fiscal year 1999	Fiscal year 2000	Total
Spending without reform <sup>1</sup>	4,787	7,200	7,818	8,796	9,613	38,214
Health Security Act spending	9,021	14,647	18,509	23,207	28,061	93,445
New program spending:						
New Federal funds for program	4,500	7,800	11,000	14,700	18,700	56,700
Estimated Medicaid transfer <sup>2</sup>	1,429	2,311	2,819	3,380	3,882	13,822
Federal spending on continuing Medicaid community-based long-term care <sup>3</sup>	3,092	4,535	4,690	5,127	5,478	22,923
Change in Federal spending on community-based long-term care	4,234	7,447	10,691	14,412	18,447	55,231

<sup>1</sup> Projected Medicaid spending for home health, home and community-based waivers, personal care, frail elderly, and community-supported living arrangements (CSLA).<sup>2</sup> Federal Medicaid spending on persons with severe disabilities who are expected to be transferred to the new program. Assumes that no more than 75 percent of the new program's expenditures will be used for the Medicaid severely disabled during the phase-in.<sup>3</sup> Medicaid with federal matching funds for home and community-based long-term care continues for the non-severely disabled and the severely disabled not served through the new program. Program is not fully implemented until FY 2003.

The Medicaid offset estimate reflects more recent data than were available at the time that the FY 1995 Budget was prepared. Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Note.—Please refer to the Key Assumptions listed in the Methods Paper for this report.

Source: ASPE.

In the absence of comprehensive reform, the federal government would spend an estimated \$9.6 billion in Medicaid funds on home health, personal health care services, and home and community-based waivers in states in the year 2000.

Under the Health Security Act, states will receive an estimated \$18.7 billion in new federal funds in the year 2000 for the new program for persons with severe disabilities. Additionally, states will receive an estimated \$3.9 billion in federal Medicaid offset amounts to reflect Medicaid savings from the new long-term care program.

States will receive an estimated \$5.5 billion in the year 2000 in federal Medicaid funds for community-based services that continue to be offered through Medicaid.

Between 1996 and 2000, federal spending for home and community-based long-term care will increase by an estimated \$55.2 billion under the Health Security Act.

## D. Public Health Initiatives Under the Health Security Act

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FUNDING FOR STATES: 1997–2000

(In millions of dollars)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
New PHS funds	3,630	4,005	3,955	3,555	15,145
Health services and workforce funding <sup>1</sup>	2,630	2,905	2,855	2,455	10,845

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FUNDING FOR STATES: 1997–2000—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Health research funding <sup>2</sup>	1,000	1,100	1,100	1,100	4,300
Offsets <sup>3</sup>	1,582	2,510	2,729	2,729	9,550
Total funds	2,048	1,495	1,226	826	5,599

<sup>1</sup> Federal funds for health-related services and workforce are allocated to States based on the State's percentage of its population beneath the poverty level in 1992.<sup>2</sup> Federal funds for health research are allocated to states using proportional distribution based on total fiscal year 1993 AHCPR and NIH funds to each State.<sup>3</sup> Offsets are allocated to States based on fiscal year 1993 distribution of funds from HRSA, SAMHSA, CDC, IHS, and NIH.

Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Note.—It is assumed that all States will implement reform in 1997.

Source: OASH, PHS.

Between 1997 and 2000, Public Health Initiatives of the Health Security Act will provide the states and its localities with an estimated \$5.6 billion in new funds for its community health centers, training of primary care physicians, core public health functions such as immunizations and disease prevention, and health research, among other programs.

With universal coverage, payments from health plans will replace (offset) the current Public Health funds for the personal health services, totalling approximately \$9.6 billion between 1997 and 2000.

## FOOTNOTES

\*Note: This analysis includes the major ways that states will be affected by the Health Security Act; other sectors that will be affected such as hospital and local governments, are not described in this report.

\*\*The weighted average premium is the average of the accepted bids for all health plans in the alliance, weighted to reflect enrollment of eligible individuals among the plans.

<sup>1</sup> Health Care Financing Administration, as published in Levit, et al., "Health Affairs," Fall 1993.

<sup>2</sup> National Association of State Legislatures, 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Health Care Financing Administration, Office of the Actuary. Per capita from 1992. As cited in Office of Management and Budget Health Reform Briefing Book, October, 1993.

<sup>4</sup> National Association of Budget Officers, 1993.

<sup>5</sup> Congressional Research Service, Medical Source Book, 1993 Update. Prepared for the Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, January 1993, P. 48.

<sup>6</sup> Health Care Financing Administration, as compiled by The Urban Institute, 1993. As cited in Office of Management and Budget Health Reform Briefing Book, October, 1993.

<sup>7</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Monthly Vital Statistics Report," 42(2s), August 31, 1993.

<sup>8</sup> Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association. State Legislative Health Care and insurance issues, 1993 Survey of Plans.

<sup>9</sup> Office of Management and Budget Health Policy. Health Reform Briefing Book: States, October 1993.

<sup>10</sup> The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has produced a higher premium estimate than the Administration's. The CBO also estimates larger employer discounts. On balance, both the CBO and the Administration predict the Health Security Act will re-

duce business spending compared with current policy by similar amounts. (CBO, "An Analysis of the Administration's Health Proposal," February 8, 1994, p. 54.)

Source: ASPE and the Urban Institute's TRIM2 Model, benchmarked to HCFA's National Health Accounts.

<sup>11</sup> Estimates of the impact of the Health Security Act on all states assume that states implement reform in January of 1996, 1997, or 1998, as specified in the Act. Please refer to the Key Assumptions listed in the Methods Paper for this report.

Assume that: States will continue their spending on non-cash adult wrap-around services; sources of revenue for Medicaid disproportionate share remain and funds were used for uncompensated care.

Estimated savings will change slightly due to normal baseline revisions which accompany new economic data.

Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding. Source: HCFA OACT, OLP and ASPE.

<sup>12</sup> Medicaid savings for community-based care reported here differ from community-based term care savings reported in section C because Medicaid savings do not include non-Medicaid (state-only) spending or the new program spending. Please refer to the Key Assumptions listed in the Methods Paper for this report.

Assume: States will continue their current spending level for non-cash adult wrap-around services, current state sources of revenue for Medicaid disproportionate share remain and funds are used for uncompensated care.

Long-term care includes both institutional and community-based long-term care. These estimates include offsets due to the new community-based long-term care program (see next section).

Maintenance of effort payments include expenditures for alliance-covered services and disproportionate share for the non-cash population and wrap-around services for cash-eligible children.

Numbers may not sum to totals due to rounding.

<sup>13</sup> This assumes universal coverage in 1997. Medicaid savings will be larger if states adopt universal coverage during 1996. Please refer to the Key Assumptions listed in the Methods Paper for this report.

Mr. DASCHLE. I hope we will have a serious discussion about cost savings and I hope we can agree on one thing as it relates to cost. I hope we can all agree we will not support any plan which fails to produce at least the savings that have been laid out in the Clinton plan. Let us use that as the base, the threshold. Let us assume we cannot provide any credibility to any other plan that does not at least achieve the savings in the Clinton plan.

The Health and Human Services report breaks down the costs between employers and employees. It raises the issue, as well, of an employer mandate; the "M" word—mandate. There are those who would have us believe we could avoid the "M" word, this mandate. But those who do ignore the mandate we have in our current system. We have a mandate in our current system that is often overlooked. It is there every day, and we are blind to it so often, but it is there in the most inequitable way.

I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection.

The Senator is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. The mandate I am referring to, of course, is the status quo mandate, the mandate that says those who pay will pay for those who do not pay.

If we had ever designed a new system and somebody had come to this Chamber and proposed that method of financing, I think we would probably have laughed them out of the Chamber. That Senator would not get one vote for the mandate that exists in the system today: Those who pay, pay for those who do not pay.

How inequitable could it be? Yet there are those who suggest we keep that current mandate, that we keep the current system, that we allow what they would call a volunteer system to prevail. Yet that volunteer system is no more than an euphemism for the status quo mandate that exists right now.

There are those who suggest it is inequitable, but that the alternative ought not involve the employers; that it is too burdensome, somehow, for the small employer. My question to those advocates of a shift in the responsibility onto the family is, if it is too expensive and too burdensome for a small business, how is it not so burdensome for small families, for young families just trying to get started? How is it that a family mandate is more politically acceptable than a small-business-shared responsibility?

What we are suggesting is that businesses and families share this responsibility, as we have for generations. Yet there are some who argue that there ought not be any shared responsibility, that the entire brunt of the costs of health be put on the shoulders of every working family. So they would propose we shift from a status quo mandate to a family mandate. I do not think that is any more acceptable. I hope we have the chance to talk about that a lot more in the future.

So, let us be clear about what the polls really say. They say the American people want us to solve this problem. They say the American people question we have what it takes to do it. That is what they say. They say they want us to solve this problem. So let us look at the opportunity that is now before us in the coming weeks and months as just that, as an opportunity to provide private health insurance to every American family; to demonstrate our ability to govern; to tell the American people that there are times when we can put politics aside as Democrats and as Republicans, and do it right.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WOFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] is recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, quite often on these Thursday mornings, or on other days, I have come to the Senate floor, and often with the Senator from South Dakota, who is giving such

good leadership in this fight for guaranteed health insurance, private health insurance for all Americans—we have come to the floor to speak about what is happening to people in our States under our current health care system.

Many of our colleagues have done this in a series we have called Faces of the Health Care Crisis, the human faces that go with the figures, the statistics, and the problems that have been presented to us.

Little did we expect that talking about a crisis would become controversial here in Washington. The crisis concept is not so difficult for Pennsylvanians that I have spoken with over the past 2 years: People who have come to hearings and roundtables all over Pennsylvania; people whose stories I have tried to tell from this spot; people who are feeling in their lives the crisis we are talking about; people who have seen their coverage cut off when they lose a job, when they change a job, when they retire from a job, and—most absurdly—welfare recipients who lose their coverage when they get a job; small business owners who have seen their premiums skyrocket 20 or even 30 percent a year when they or one of their employees, or their children, get a serious illness; older citizens who had to spend down—what a word that is—spend down their life savings in order to pay for nursing home care and have gotten no support for home care which is the most cost-effective and humane way, so often, to give care for long-term problems and for older citizens.

Because of stories like that, Pennsylvanians gave a verdict a few years ago when they sent me here on whether to reform our health care system. They did not know exactly what the plan should be that would reach the goal they knew, but they knew they wanted to have health care reform reach that goal.

So now we have the great opportunity within our reach, we have the opportunity to go forward. We have a President and a Congress, we have Democrats and a goodly number of Republicans working on the question of how to do it. But as we have that opportunity before us, the historic proponents of reform are trying to change the clock back, the same special interests who fought against Medicare, who beat Harry Truman and even Richard Nixon with scare tactics about socialized medicine.

But there is another way to keep us from moving forward. Now some people in Washington want to keep talking about health care reform as if it is another political horse race. This week, they are talking about polls and where the President's health care plan stands in the polls. It should come as no surprise to anyone who has run for office that the Health Insurance Association of America got its money's worth out of their spokesmodels, Harry and Louise.

People in this city are experts in moving poll numbers. That is how they get here in the first place. So let us not act surprised that the Health Insurance Associations' millions of dollars in deceptive TV ads, financed by premium dollars paid by their own customers, have served their purpose: To turn skepticism into cynicism, confusion into fear.

This afternoon, our Republican colleagues are going to Annapolis for a health care retreat, an attempt to reach consensus on health care reform. I am glad they are going to do this, and I wish them well. It is an important development that they are spending a weekend on what to do about health care. A few years ago, many Republicans dismissed the importance of health care reform, and I doubt that they would have done this. I also would not have imagined 3 years ago so many Republican colleagues would be supporting proposals that do go a significant, remarkable distance further toward Harry Truman's goal of guaranteeing private health insurance for all Americans. They do not go far enough yet, but they have gone a good distance.

The progress we have made is real. The common ground is important. Many Republicans are very serious about this issue and want to be constructive, and I am counting on them to help us to succeed together.

So it is good for them to leave Washington for a couple of days because whenever we go beyond the beltway and listen to our fellow Americans, wherever we are—back home or in Annapolis—we see that they do not share Washington's view of health care reform as a spectator sport. People want information, that is for sure, a lot more information than they can get in the 30-second ad, but they are not interested in which party wins, which loses. And the latest punditry in poll numbers—who is up and down—may have been interesting in Lillehammer, but the Winter Olympics are now over and it is time for spring planting and it is time for a crop this summer that will give the American people their long-sought goal of universal health insurance.

I find that what citizens really want to know is whether their health insurance cannot be taken away, whether they can choose their own health plan, whether their premiums are going to continue to go up and up.

Americans are justifiably confused about how any particular health plan will work. But they know what they want. To put it simply, they want what we have, what Senators and Members of Congress and 9 million other Federal employees have—a menu of affordable health plans in which both the employer and the employees contribute.

So I hope our Republican colleagues will use this opportunity to back away

from the confusion and the complexity of the insider's game and go back to the basics, to the simple questions which truly define the health care debate, questions which point to the key elements of any solution to the problem.

To make their work easier, I offer these five key questions that they and all of us must answer: How do you guarantee private health insurance to every American? It is easy to share the goal of universal health care. Let us all very firmly agree that health insurance for every American is our goal. I think a strong majority of us in this body agree with that, but how are we and how do you, my Republican colleagues, propose to proceed, and are you ready to take the steps needed to reach that goal?

The President and 31 cosponsors of the Health Security Act have spelled out how to make that guarantee of private health insurance a reality. How would my Republican colleagues do it? We would build on the present American system of employer-employee mutual contribution, which is a fact of life for a great majority of Americans with health insurance today. We would build on it and extend it to all working Americans. How do my Republican colleagues propose to do it?

Then how do we plan and how do you, my Republican colleagues, plan to control the costs of health care? Many Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment but oppose real cost control in health care. I cannot reconcile those positions. We cannot end the Federal deficit without controlling the skyrocketing costs of Medicaid and Medicare. But you cannot simply cap those entitlements because all that will do is to shift costs on to the private sector and make the burden on business and families and individuals even heavier. Paying customers will pay more and more to cover the uninsured and the underinsured. That is not fair and it is not smart.

The President's Health Security Act proposes very specific ways in which we will bring down the inflation in health care costs. It proposes a structure of competition of the private health care plans for purchasing pools that will be our purchasing pools. It proposes a structure of consumer cooperatives that put the consumers in the driver's seat and no longer leave the choice of health plans just to employers and to insurance companies.

We propose standby backup premium caps. Insurance companies in other fields—automobile insurance, worker's compensation—are used to limits on the amount they can increase each year. We would propose some standby limits on how much premiums can increase each year, how much they can increase beyond the cost-of-living increase.

But what do our Republican colleagues propose? What is their alter-

native? How will they bring down the cost of health insurance that is breaking our national budget, but, even more importantly, is affecting the burden and the budget of every family, every business, every State and local government in this country?

Then how do we make sure that Americans have the ability to choose their own doctors? Many of our colleagues love to talk about the importance of choice of doctors. I agree with them. But like our friends, Harry and Louise—our friends on the other side of the aisle have talked about that—they do not seem to realize that more and more people are losing or do not have that choice of doctor today. More and more companies are turning to the lowest costs HMO with a limited list of doctors and saying, take it or leave it.

A recent study by KPMG Peat Marwick revealed that, as recently as 1988, 73 percent of all employer plans allowed individuals to choose their own doctor. But by 1993, only 49 percent of employer-paid health plans still give that choice, and the trend is only going stronger. It is going down to less and less choice of your own doctor unless we do something.

Our proposed Health Security Act does something. It provides that every American in health insurance purchasing cooperatives, called alliances, will have a menu of choice that always must include a plan to choose your own doctor and which provides competition so that you are likely to be able to find your own doctor in a number of plans.

This proposal will increase the choice of plans and the choice of your own doctor for Americans, and I wish to see the alternatives that will help stop the trend that is taking that fundamental choice more and more from the American people.

So I ask our Republican colleagues to help us reverse that trend and tell us how they would do so, if they do not want to go the route that we have proposed.

Then are you, my Republican colleagues, prepared to enact real health insurance reform? Under the current system, insurance companies have the power to jack up rates, especially on older citizens—charge them four times what younger citizens are charged—to cut off coverage for people with pre-existing conditions, and establish limits on the amount of benefits people can receive. Are you ready to enact real insurance reform that not only prohibits these insurance company practices but establishes a system that finally puts consumers in the driver's seat instead of the insurance companies.

Finally, for today, of the five questions I am contributing to our Republican colleagues' retreat, what will you do to protect older citizens? Whatever its shortcomings, Medicare is one of the most successful programs ever cre-

ated. Every serious health reform plan calls for savings for Medicare.

What will you, my Republican colleagues, do to protect the seniors who depend on Medicare? Will you include a prescription drug benefit as the Health Security Act does? What will you do about long-term care? Will you take some steps to make that more available? And, particularly, will you take steps to provide assistance for home care, family home care?

I think that most of us want bipartisan action on health care reform, but real health care reform requires answers to these questions. I put proposals from Democrats like Representative COOPER to this same test, asking how will they advance toward the goal of guaranteed, affordable, private health insurance for every American.

After all, that is really the point of a strategic retreat like the one our colleagues are about to have, that is going to begin in Annapolis. It is to figure out how to advance.

I hope we will advance, and we will advance together. The logic of the facts demand it; the American people demand it, because for all the efforts to confuse this issue and to highlight how complicated it all is, the bottom line is really very simple. Complexity is often the last excuse of those who want to do nothing.

So help us answer these questions, my colleagues. They will not be easy to answer. It is complicated, but we can do it if we move together and we do it with determination, and if we tap the better angels of our nature. To cite the great Republican who showed us how to bind up the wounds of the Nation and, "with malice toward none," move forward to achieve the goals of this Union.

The other day the head of the Congressional Budget Office, Dr. Reischauer, at the end of his testimony, said he hoped the facts that he was contributing, and the facts that we need to get together and look at hard, would not torpedo this opportunity for fundamental health care reform but instead would be used to build a reform that achieves what our economy and our country need.

He said he hoped that someday those of us who have something to do with this legislation in these next months will be able to do what a congressional committee did when it visited the Lyndon Johnson Library and looked at the exhibit on the Medicare bill and the signing of the Medicare bill, and were able to turn to their grandchildren and say, "That is something that I contributed to, to the well-being of this country, to the common good of America." He said he hoped someday those of us who have this opportunity today to craft this legislation, with our grandchildren in tow will be able to say, "Here is the bill that in 1994 we put together which made our health care sys-

tem more equitable, more efficient, and less costly."

We can do it, Mr. President. Let us do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] has control of not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair.

#### RETENTION OF TOUGH PROVISIONS OF THE CRIME BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, despite President Clinton's rhetorical support for congressional passage of a strong anticrime bill, the prevailing view inside the beltway is that weakening changes will be made to the Senate-passed bill to soften liberal opposition. This \$22.8 billion measure still awaits action in the House of Representatives and, following House action, the measure will be sent to a conference committee. What remains to be seen is how many of the tough provisions in the Senate bill will survive the conference with the other body.

Representatives from more than 20 organizations, including civil rights and criminal defense organizations, have reportedly begun weekly meetings to develop strategies for winning major changes in the Senate crime bill. These groups took heart in the fact that President Clinton did not explicitly endorse the Senate crime bill or most of its measures. According to the Washington director of the American Civil Liberties Union, "There's enough wiggle room to give everybody the political capital they need." Congressional Quarterly, January 29, 1994. This is the sort of political wiggling and compromising law abiding Americans can ill afford.

The ACLU has declared the Senate's 95 to 4 passage of the crime bill "a shocking demonstration of excess in a politically charged atmosphere." The ACLU has examined the bill and, in a recent memorandum, has targeted more than 25 significant proposals for elimination or significant revision citing "major civil liberties concerns."

These measures include the organization's longstanding target—the death penalty. As well, several other popularly supported criminal justice reforms, such as enhanced mandatory minimum sentences for violent offenders and increased victims rights proposals have been targeted.

The proposals which the ACLU disapproves of are as follows:

First, a comprehensive Federal death penalty for heinous crimes including terrorism, espionage, and large scale drug trafficking;

Second, prosecution of violent teenagers as adults;

Third, federalizing serious gang offenses;

Fourth, the Republican version of the three-time-loser bill. Ironically, follow-

ing the ACLU's issuance of its memo, the administration has proposed its own version of a three-time-loser law which is substantially narrower than the versions passed by the Senate;

Fifth, increased mandatory minimum sentencing for violent offenders;

Sixth, enhanced maximum penalties for numerous offenses including drug dealing in prison and drug dealing near schools;

Seventh, a funding mechanism to insure that the \$22.8 billion promised in the bill is actually delivered. They would do away with that as well.

Eighth, a proposal for the expedited removal of alien terrorists;

Ninth, expedited deportation of criminal aliens;

Tenth, requiring State and local government to cooperate with INS officials in immigration cases;

Eleventh, a prohibition on payment of non-health-related Federal benefits to illegal aliens;

Twelfth, criminalizing the direct support of terrorist activities;

Thirteenth, grants to States for pre-trial drug testing;

Fourteenth, postconviction drug testing of Federal offenders;

Fifteenth, grants to States for boot-camps;

Sixteenth, a requirement that court clerks report cash bail postings in excess of \$10,000;

Seventeenth, a voluntary motor vehicle theft prevention program;

Eighteenth, changes to the rules of evidence to make evidence of similar crimes admissible in sex offense cases;

Nineteenth, judicial restrictions on the scope and availability of prison caps;

Twentieth, violence against women proposals including mandatory restitution to victims of sexual assault and HIV testing of defendants in sex offense cases.

I cannot for the life of me understand why they are against all of these things. But that is the Biden-Hatch bill, and we think it is long overdue.

Twenty-first, a prohibition against the improper disclosure of information obtained through a wiretap;

Twenty-second, a measure which insures that victims of crime will have the right to address the court prior to sentencing;

Twenty-third, prohibitions against the obstruction or interference with a lawful hunt on Federal land;

Twenty-fourth, a study requiring the Attorney General to study the ways in which antiloitering laws can be used to fight crime without violating one's constitutional rights and to prepare a model antiloitering statute; and

Twenty-fifth, a prohibition against prisoners receiving low-income, higher education grants.

As Congress moves closer to final passage of the crime bill, members must resolve whether they will come

down on the side of strong law enforcement and victims or on the side of the ACLU. It will be interesting to see what transpires.

We need President Clinton to speak out specifically in favor of the tough provisions in the Senate's crime bill.

I can see maybe differences over one or two of them, but not 25.

Without his leadership, I fear these provisions will come under attack in the other body and in Congress.

#### THE NEED TO RETAIN THE ANTIGANG PROVISION OF THE CRIME BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today's Washington Post contains an editorial critical of the Senate passed Dole-Hatch antigang amendment writing that it:

Would cause a major restructuring of criminal law enforcement that is unnecessary and for which the federal system is not prepared.

Mr. President, I believe our gang amendment is necessary and if Federal law enforcement is not prepared, as the Post opines, the responsibility for this current erosion of Federal law enforcement rests with the Clinton administration.

Our antigang amendment responds to the epidemic of gang violence which is gripping our Nation's urban and rural areas. Our Nation's heartland is witnessing an unprecedented growth in gang violence—a scourge known all too well to cities like Los Angeles and New York City.

The antigang amendment makes it a Federal offense to engage in gang-related crime and subjects gang members to tough mandatory minimum penalties. I can think of no area where there is a greater Federal interest than in assisting the States in the prosecution and incarceration of violent offenders. This is especially true given that much of the drugs and firearms used by gangs in States like Utah cross State lines.

The administration recognizes the need for a Federal role in this area. Only 2 days ago, the administration announced that it would be mounting a major Federal antigang initiative which would target our Nation's most violent gangs. According to a Justice Department memo, reported in the March 1, 1994 edition of the Post, "Now when a gang member is caught, law enforcement officials will decide whether he should be prosecuted in Federal court."

The first responsibility of Government is to ensure the safety of the public. I submit that the Federal Government's role in ensuring our safety must be measured by more than just grant dollars. The Federal Government, as a result of the Controlled Substance Act, has jurisdiction over virtually all drug trafficking, manufacturing, and dis-

tribution offenses. Yet, most drug cases are still prosecuted at the State and local level. This is because the Federal law enforcement agencies have worked in a coordinated manner with local officials so that the U.S. resources can be used most effectively. This is precisely what we intend to see happen with our amendment.

The Post also argues that there is not enough Federal prison space and that the FBI doesn't have the manpower to take up these cases. It is true that the administration's policies and budget priorities diminishes our Federal law enforcement presence. But Congress cannot let the administration's inadequate commitment to Federal law enforcement dictate the scope and strength of its anticrime proposals.

It should be noted that President Clinton's proposed fiscal year 1995 budget cuts the Bureau of Prisons construction and operation budget by over \$78 million, a cut of nearly 30 percent. The President's budget also cuts 1,523 Department of Justice law enforcement agency positions. The FBI will lose 847 positions, the Drug Enforcement Agency will lose 355, the Department's Criminal Division will lose 28, the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces will lose 150, and Federal prosecutors will lose 143 positions. Absent these cuts, there are already 431 fewer FBI agents and 301 fewer DEA agents today than there were in 1992. Not a single new agent has been hired by either the FBI or the DEA since 1992; none, according to the President's budget, will be hired until at least 1996.

If the President truly wants to provide the States the assistance they need in fighting gang violence, both financial support and jurisdictional support, then he should voice his support the Dole-Hatch-Brown antigang amendment to the crime bill. So too should he reassess these dangerous cuts to law enforcement.

#### THE DIETARY SUPPLEMENT INDUSTRY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I close, let me take this opportunity to express my views on an issue which I know is also of deep concern to this body: The Food and Drug Administration's continued efforts to persecute the dietary supplement industry. The FDA's persistent hyper-regulatory zeal in removing products from the market and limiting consumer access to legitimate scientific information never fails to amaze me.

The urgent need prompting my legislation—S. 784—to create a rational regulatory environment for dietary supplements is being underscored this morning.

Eleven of America's foremost scientists, acting at the behest of the Alliance for Aging Research, issued a recommended daily level for antioxidant

vitamins, vitamins which can prevent heart disease, cancer, cataracts, and other conditions associated with aging.

What is significant about this event is that these scientists and the Alliance for Aging Research are being forced to have a press conference to publicize antioxidants, because the FDA has refused to tell the public about their benefits. In fact, this is not an error of omission, but rather one of commission. The FDA has specifically turned down requests to approve a health claim for antioxidants.

Some of my colleagues may have seen a segment about this on the Today show this morning. Dr. Jeff Blumberg from Tufts University, representing the 11 scientists, made an excellent presentation which really drove home two important points: First, the FDA has set up barriers so that consumers simply cannot receive information about the benefits of dietary supplements; and second, good nutrition is important, but diet alone cannot supply the recommended level of antioxidants. Supplements are also needed.

I want to commend the Alliance, which is the first public health organization to issue recommended daily antioxidant levels through a combination of diet and supplementation. Their bold step to protect the public health is an action the FDA should emulate.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

#### THE CRIME BILL

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, if I might just respond to the good statement of the distinguished Senator from Utah that he just made on crime, I share, as I suspect everybody in the Midwest does, his concern for rising crime, particularly rising adolescent crime.

I also point out that much of the dilemma that we are going to face in law enforcement, as the distinguished Senator just pointed out, is with reference to the FBI, which has not hired, it is my understanding, since March 1992, an additional agent. Much of that is caused by the budget caps that have been imposed.

I am prepared to work with the Senator from Utah and others who are concerned about how we provide resources that are consistent with their own caps. We all talk about crime. We all talk about wanting to provide additional resources. We just had the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms before the Appropriations Committee yesterday. We are asking for more money for the Achilles Task Force and we are asking for continued support for our program called the Gang Resistance Education and Training Program, both of which are the very sorts of col-

laborative efforts that the distinguished Senator is trying to develop.

The dilemma is we have caps that are going to force us really to engage in a debate about what our priorities are. It seems to me that particularly, for example, in Omaha, NE, since 1985, 1986, and 1987, in that range, our city was invaded by crack cocaine. We all know from our own hearings and discussions with law enforcement officers how crack cocaine has changed the nature of law enforcement. It just seems to me as well that we have not really been terribly realistic about the need to provide the resources commensurate with our own urgency, at least as expressed by our speeches.

Unless we do, Mr. President, it seems to me that we are going to have to disclose to the American people that there is a lot of hypocrisy in our words, and that we do not really mean what we say. We will talk about crime, and then not follow through.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KERREY. Certainly. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. We actually have the money in this bill because of the genius of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in providing for that \$22.3 billion.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. We have to put our money where our mouths are in this matter because we can no longer allow rampant crime.

I want to thank my dear colleague for his kind remarks.

Mr. KERREY. I appreciate that.

#### HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I come today to discuss briefly the health care debate.

The Republican Members of this body are having a retreat. I think those of us on the other side of the aisle need to listen very carefully when they come back from their retreat as to what they are willing to do. The one thing that I believe strongly about health care today is that the American people cannot afford in 1994 for us to do nothing; that we have to have the wisdom and the perseverance necessary to put together a piece of legislation that has both Republicans and Democrats on it.

We ought to give some on this side of the aisle, and they ought to give some on their side of the aisle in an effort to enact legislation.

Mr. President, since the President introduced his legislation which he presented to the American people last fall, I have made an effort to learn what is in that bill. I view the President's bill as the vehicle for action. He, after all, is the President. He has spent a great deal of take time looking at that issue.

He has presented a very thoughtful piece of legislation, frankly not as con-

fusing as described. There are 11 sections in it. Yes, the legislation is long. It is 1,300 or 1,400 pages. But it seems to me on an issue this important, we should not expect to get three or four pages of law. It is long; it is thoughtful; it is detailed; and it specifies how the bills are to be paid. And it provides for universal coverage.

I have found, in my own presentations to audiences, that when they are presented with the facts of what is in the bill, No. 1, they say, "Gosh, this is not as confusing as I thought." And, second, they say, "I am sort of comforted by the language. It is not as obscure as I thought."

I heard the distinguished President pro tempore, the occupant of the chair, talk at length about the need for us to understand the law. And thus I think it is very important in this debate for Americans really to become familiar with this proposal.

I myself want to amend the bill, want to make changes in this legislation. But it is rather difficult for me to make changes unless I know what is in it.

It is interesting as you watch the critics. I see in one week the Business Roundtable says, "We won't support the President's bill because it does too much." The next week, the American Association of Retired People says, "We will not support the bill because it does too little."

That, it seems to me, sort of frames the argument. We are going to have people opposed to the legislation because it does not do enough, or we will have people opposing it because it does too much. We have to figure out how to change this piece of legislation so we can pass it. We cannot allow the status quo to continue. We know that, Mr. President.

The mandated spending on health care, Medicare, and Medicaid will increase another \$30 billion from last year to this. The principal reason we are struggling to find money for crime and transportation and economic development and education is that these health care programs are squeezing out these other spending items. The domestic accounts will all go down in total this year; whereas, the mandated programs are all going to go up. We have no change. We know that.

People are still out there with pre-existing conditions. Individuals are rationing their care. Americans at age 55 are praying that nothing happens to them for the 10 years before they become eligible for Medicare. People are confused about the current system. There are businesses that are unable to purchase a product, and there are all kinds of freezes beyond our own budget for us to take action.

We do not have to wait for a problem to affect a majority of us; it need not affect 60 percent or 51 percent of the American people. This affects every

one of us, in my judgment, through the increased cost of taxation. But it affects a sufficient number of Americans in a very terrifying and real form who wonder whether or not they are going to get care for us to act as well.

Mr. President, there are four areas where I am going to focus my attention. The first is in the area of insurance reform. The insurance industry has changed dramatically from 3 years ago. They are saying: We will accept the need for community rating and accept the need for comprehensive uniformity in benefits at the national level. We need to lock that reform in. I believe we can get agreement between the Republicans and Democrats on that issue and find common ground so the American people can begin to get a little less confused about what it is that we support.

Second, the welfare system is broken. The Medicaid system traps people, makes it difficult for people to get back into the work force and encourages the wrong kind of behavior. We need to reform that system, Mr. President, and disclose to the American people that all of us pay for health care through our tax system; and disclose to the American people that if you have household income of, say, \$30,000 a year, it is apt that you are already paying \$3,000 or \$4,000 through your tax system. We need to disclose that so that we can design a means to allow individuals who are receiving State and Federal payments for health care in low-income categories to move back into the work force. It is relatively easy to envision a way to do that with merely a sliding scale, using the tax system to adjust the subsidy as an individual goes back to work.

I do not like the idea, Mr. President, of having somebody sit out there and say that you have to meet this arbitrary guideline of 100 percent or 200 percent. Use our tax system. It is relatively easy for me to imagine a compromise between Republicans and Democrats on Medicaid reform. There is an urgent need to do it. Because it has long-term care in it, we can address that rather difficult problem simultaneously, I hope.

The third area is that I think there is generalized agreement that rather than having the Government regulate price and do cost control, we need to move in a direction where individuals are taking more risk, where individuals are getting information about price and quality and making decisions based on that information. That is what the President has talked about over and over again. His critics say he wants to have the Government do it. That is not true. There is an agreement between the Republicans and Democrats that we need to move away from Government regulation of health care and in the direction of having individuals make more decisions about price and

quality. A relatively small number of adjustments in our Tax Code would provide those incentives. And, again, I see consensus emerging between Democrats and Republicans to do it.

The last area is the area of accountability. The system is not very accountable, whether the issue is an individual that has been injured and wants damages through a tort system that is difficult, or whether a provider is trying to defend against some very unreasonable and silly lawsuits, or whether, Mr. President, you are talking about the accountability provided by us as politicians by telling the American people how we are paying the bill, there is an urgent need to provide a simplified way for individuals to come and appeal a decision that is negative, either by an insurance company or by Federal payer benefits. We cannot have Americans flying to Baltimore, MD, or to some insurance company headquarters, to appeal. We know accountability is something we can lock in with Republican and Democratic support.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I really think there is consensus in this body, and I will listen with a great deal of interest when the Republicans come back off of their retreat. I know a majority of Republicans want to enact legislation this year. Our job is to write law, Mr. President. This Senate sometimes does not do that. We have an opportunity, I think, to lead now—to lead by doing the hard work of looking at the law, ignoring the rhetoric, and looking at the detail of this legislation and coming together to try to provide the American people in fact exactly what they want, which is comprehensive coverage for every single American, and a system they can understand.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). Under the order, Mr. WALLOP is to be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

Mr. WALLOP. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have had a number of people come to me. The Senator from Colorado has a couple minutes he would like to speak, and Senator DASCHLE wants to speak. We will raise that after the Senator completes his.

#### A TRIBUTE TO TED NUGENT

Mr. WALLOP. Madam President, once in a while on this floor, we have the privilege to leave politics behind and recognize outstanding achievements of Americans. So today I would like to pay tribute to a great friend and a great American, Mr. Ted Nugent. A few Senators, and most of their children, will know him as one of the world's great rock stars, a man who

has sold over 20 million albums in his impressive 27-year career, and who continues to sell out arenas and stadiums across the globe. His musical abilities are truly legendary.

Madam President, I know a different Ted Nugent. Ted Nugent is a hunter who happens to be a rock star, not a rock star who happens to be a hunter.

I teamed up with Ted last fall to launch a program called Hunters for the Hungry in Wyoming. The program is classically simple. It is all volunteer. Hunters and their families team up with meat processors across the State to distribute game meat that they harvest to the tables of the hungry. The success was absolutely phenomenal. Although the final numbers are not yet in, Becky Massengill, president of the Wyoming Food Bank, tells me that in this first year of the Hunters for the Hungry Program, Wyoming hunters donated thousands of pounds of game meat to hungry families in our State.

I know it seems strange to some Members of Congress that we did not build a single Federal bureaucracy in order to achieve these amazing results. There was no big Government and no redtape. Let me emphasize again that it was all volunteer. And it is a testament for what reinventing government should be all about. Get government out of the way, and people can do incredible things.

Ted Nugent flew out to our great cowboy State, and we began with a rally at the University of Wyoming, where Ted mesmerized an audience of college students and their friends with his music and his presence. He emphasized the importance of hunting in America and how it builds strength in family members. It is a family value, especially in a State such as ours.

Ted and I then embarked on an antelope hunt as guests of Deborah Bradbury at the Bradbury Ranch in Glenrock, WY. Our hunt—our amusing and exciting hunt—was captured by the Nashville Network's "Celebrity Outdoors" program which aired last month.

After a successful hunt, we donated our game to the Wyoming Food Bank.

What most impressed me about Ted Nugent is his commitment to the real America. His message is clear. He cares about our country. He cares about our family, his family, and others of America, and he leads by example.

In an industry that is filled with self-importance and has been the topic of some conversation within the Senate and within Congress, he has avoided all the self-importance, all the greed, all the moral corruption, and stands out above it. He is a cheerleader for the real hard-working folks, the law-abiding folks of America.

He is so committed to America's children that he is a national spokesman for the Drug Abuse Resistance Program called DARE. Many Senators

know about it. He donates his time to remind our children of the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse.

Madam President, I said that Ted leads by example. DARE could not have a better example. Ted Nugent never had a drink of alcohol, never smoked, and never used drugs in his life—this is in an industry known to be completely surrounded by all of these events.

Ted is also a founder of a something called KAMP for kids. It is a place where youngsters in America learn the importance of the out of doors and woodsmanship and conservation. His antidrug message is a cornerstone of that organization.

I encourage any family in America with children to look into this truly wonderful program. Once again, it is free from the twisting, strangling arms of Government. It is the brain-child of a great American entertainer.

Ted's message is being heard through a variety of media. He is not only an accomplished author but is the editor and publisher of his own outdoors magazine. He is heard on hundreds of radio stations throughout the country as the official rock and roll hunting conservation representative for Rush Limbaugh's program.

So I would just say, Madam President, to Ted Nugent, thank you for your message, thank you most of all for your unselfish actions, thank you very much for being a tremendous example to youngsters in America who love rock music and see that it can be done without filth, without drugs, without alcohol, with a great example, with the enthusiasm and fun which is what music should always be.

Let me say once again Ted Nugent is a hunter who just happens to a rock star, a rock star who is an example for all of us, hunters or not.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### HEALTH CARE FOR ALL

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, today and tomorrow, the Senate Republicans will attend a meeting on health care. Senator DOLE asked me to adjust the Senate schedule to accommodate their meeting. I was happy to do so. Democrats have had many such meetings on this issue and will have many more. I commend Senator DOLE and other Republican leaders for their attention to this critical matter. There is no issue more urgent, no concern more pressing to American families than the need to reform our Nation's health care system.

While there are many points on which we disagree, Democrats and many Republicans share a commitment to assure that every American has private health insurance that cannot be taken away.

Nearly 40 million Americans have no health insurance, millions of others—in fact, nearly all Americans—fear losing coverage if they become seriously ill or lose their job.

Many Americans have the most basic decisions of their life dominated by concerns about the cost of health care. Whether to marry. Whether to have children. Where to work. Where to live.

These fundamental decisions of life should not be dictated by concerns about health insurance. But in the current system, for many Americans they are.

In 1960, the United States spent \$27 billion on health care. This year health care spending is expected to rise to \$950 billion.

Those numbers are so staggering that they bear repeating. From \$27 billion a year in 1960 to \$950 billion a year this year.

These costs are unsustainable for Federal and State governments, for businesses, and for American families.

President Clinton has proposed to reform the system. Every Member of Congress knows that reform must come. And the American people are demanding reform—reform which will assure them the security of health care insurance that is permanent, guaranteed, can never be taken away.

There has been much debate about the merits and the shortcomings of specific provisions of the President's health care plan. There has been less but similar debate about other health plans which have been introduced by Senators CHAFEE and DOLE and by Congressman COOPER and Senator BREAU, among others.

It is time we put aside our differences and look to our common goals, rather than concentrating our effort on only those provisions on which we disagree. It is time that we refocus on the fundamental need for legislative action this year. The problems have not gone away, rather they have gotten worse. No plan is perfect, but we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good.

Nearly every industrialized nation in the world provides health care to its citizens. Each nation's plan is different, based on the economic needs and the social customs of its people. None of these systems is without problems. Each of these nations struggles to control its health care costs. And many continue to revise their health care systems in an effort to meet the changing health and economic needs of its people.

The lesson for the United States must be a commitment to develop a way to assure to every American the security of having private health insurance that can never be taken away. We must develop a plan that is fundamentally an American plan, one that will work for us. We cannot allow ourselves to be deterred from this critical objec-

tive because it is too difficult, because there is no perfect plan, because some will have to change their business practices or because the way health care is delivered will have to be changed. Maintaining the status quo ought not to be an option. Tinkering around the edges ought not to be an option. Neither will address the fundamental problems of full coverage for all Americans and controlling costs.

I believe that we can—I believe that we must—work together to achieve our common objectives during this Congress.

We can reform our health care system. It will be done so long as all of those involved remain focused on our common goal to provide affordable health care to all of our citizens and not be distracted by those things on which we disagree.

So I wish the Republicans well during their health care meeting and I hope they will return from that meeting with a commitment to work with Democrats to enact comprehensive health care reform legislation this year—legislation which includes the one essential element for all Americans, health insurance for every American that is permanent, that is guaranteed, and that can never be taken away.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### HEALTH CARE CRISIS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I, too, wish the Republicans well on their retreat to discuss health care, and I do hope that they come back from that health care conference energized, willing to work to improve health care in America.

Madam President, there are some who are saying there is no health care crisis. I want to talk about two people who indicate to me that they are representative of many, many hundreds of thousands if not millions of people who are sick and certainly cry out that there is a health care crisis.

Madam President, I want to put a face on this principle we talk about, health care.

The first face that I want to establish is a 27-year-old woman from Reno, NV. Her name is Erin Dowell. I first met Erin about a month ago here in Washington. She was here testifying about the high cost of medical care.

When I first met her in Washington, she was a vibrant, energetic, extremely attractive red-headed woman, who was so full of life. She had at that time leukemia, a specific kind of leukemia. She told me how she had gone through the medical process, costing upward of \$300,000.

When I visited with her, she was broke. She was one of those Americans caught in the system. She had an in-

dustrial injury and, as a result of that, she lost her health insurance. The week that she was ready to go back to work, she found that she had leukemia.

Well, Madam President, I wish I could report to the people of Nevada, this Senate, and the people of America that Erin, who I saw back here so energetic, so vibrant, was still that way. But she is not.

Two weeks after I met her here in Washington, I went to Reno and I went to her home to visit her. She at that time was bedridden. She at that time had come out of remission and was extremely ill. She was laying on a sofa, covered with an electric blanket. The vibrancy I saw in her here was gone, and in Reno it looked as if she were a different person.

We visited and she was afraid. We held hands and talked. Her family was around her.

You see, the reason this story is so tragic is that she could have had a bone marrow transplant. She had a perfect donor. But that can only take place when she is in remission. Through the bureaucratic mess that she found herself in, created by the Government and insurance companies, she was unable to have her bone marrow transplant when she was in remission.

I wish I could report to everyone that she is still at home, but she is not. She is in the hospital.

I talked to her sister Kelly last night. She had an extremely bad week. She is in intensive care. She has had problems with her heart. I hope Erin lives. I do not know if Erin will live. I do not know if she will ever come out of the exacerbated condition she is in. I do not know that. No one knows that. If she does not, she will die. She knows that. We have talked about it.

But it is an example, Madam President, of how our system is not working. It is really too bad that this woman has had to go through what she has gone through. I hope that other people next year will not have to go through what she has been through.

I wish that she were the only case like this in the entire of America, but she is not. There are lots of Erin Dowells in America today.

I am going to work and I am going to hope that Erin will come out of the serious condition she is in, will be removed from intensive care and get back into an acute care bed and finally be able to go home, and, hopefully, the leukemia will go into remission and that she will be able to have this bone marrow transplant. There is a perfect match waiting to give this life-saving sustenance to Erin. I hope it works out.

I hope others do not have to go through what she has gone through. But unless we change the system, there will be many other Erin Dowells.

The same week I was in Reno, Madam President, I did a radio inter-

view that lasted half an hour. The man that did the interview—I had known him for a long time—asked me if I could wait after the interview. He had something personal he wanted to talk to me about. I am not going to embarrass him by announcing his name, but let me give you the facts.

He said, "Harry, I make \$13,000 a year here at this radio station. I have been offered raises. I cannot take them because, if I took a raise, we would be over the limit and my wife, who has 18 months to live, would be cut off medically."

Madam President, the two situations I have just related are only two. All of our senatorial offices, every congressional office, has stories just like this, stories that tear at your heartstrings.

So it is very troubling to me to find people who say: "There is no health care crisis. What's wrong with the system? Why fix something that is not broke?"

Well, I am here to say, from my perspective, the system is broke and we need to do something to fix it. We cannot go on like we are going on.

You know, it is fine for us. We have health insurance, like other Federal employees. And millions of people in America are satisfied with their health insurance benefits. But millions and millions have no health insurance. Millions and millions are going to lose the health insurance they have. We need to fix the system. It is something that cannot be fixed by tinkering at the edges.

So, Madam President, when some say there is no health care crisis, have them call me and I will talk to them about Erin, I will talk to them about my friend at the radio station.

For Erin's sake and the sake of others in America like her, we must act and we must act this year. We must, Madam President, have health care reform.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me commend the senior Senator from Nevada for his powerful statement. There is no more compelling argument to be made than to talk about the faces of real Americans who are experiencing the crisis that we talk about daily on the floor so routinely.

There is nothing routine about the crisis that those Nevada patients are experiencing. There is nothing routine about the agony and uncertainty and the extraordinary difficulty that they feel each and every day, not only that they feel but their families feel and that all of us who are touched by the lives of these people must feel.

The Senator has raised, again, a very compelling reason why health reform is so critical this year.

#### THE PROPOSED RENEWABLE OXYGENATE REQUIREMENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I want to state publicly how disappointed I am with a letter recently sent by my friend and colleague, Senator BILL BRADLEY, and a number of others to the Environmental Protection Agency attacking their proposed renewable oxygenate requirement. In attacking the requirement, the letter makes very erroneous assertions about the economic and environmental impacts of promoting renewable energy.

As many of my colleagues know, the EPA proposal, issued last December, would require that 30 percent of the oxygenated fuel used to produce reformulated gasoline—which is used to reduce ozone pollution—shall be made from renewable resources. That is, 70 percent of the oxygenates could be non-renewable.

The commitment made by EPA came after a tremendous amount of consideration and discussion of the environmental and economic objectives that could be achieved through our energy policy, as we move forward to create a cleaner environment.

As I reviewed the letter, I concluded that there must be a great deal of confusion surrounding the use of renewable fuels in reformulated gasoline. I am concerned that there will be those who are misled by the letter. There should be no mistake: This is just another in a long series of confrontations between domestically produced renewable fuel and our age-old dependence upon imported fossil fuels. There are differences of opinion, but there should be no difference on the facts.

The letter sent to Administrator Browner states that "EPA's attempt to choose the RFG 'winner' is troubling \* \* \*."

Madam President, this is not troubling at all. In fact it is long overdue. Allowing the market to decide winners and losers in this Nation's energy use has left us with the debilitating dependence upon imported fossil fuels.

None of my colleagues who support the existing tax breaks for the oil and gas industry seem to find the market a particularly satisfactory judge of energy policy. I find it particularly ironic that at a time when imported oil prices are at historically low levels and many of my colleagues are actively discussing the need for additional tax incentives to boost the domestic oil and gas industry, the EPA renewable oxygen proposal, which will undoubtedly reduce oil imports, is under attack.

EPA stated in its proposal that the renewable oxygen requirement will reduce foreign oil imports, create investment and jobs in America, reduce fossil energy use, and lower emissions of harmful greenhouse gases. These are assertions made by the EPA, based on a thorough analysis of the facts. They are not claims made by biased ethanol

or renewable fuel advocates. EPA is the agency that is given the responsibility to make decisions on environmental issues of this kind for all of us, taking into account all the data and all the information.

The consequences of the renewable oxygenate proposal noted by EPA strike me as objectives that the market has thus far failed to achieve, and which merit considerably more attention in formulating this Nation's energy policy.

The Natural Resources Defense Council [NRDC], a leading environmental organization, stated in its comments to EPA on the renewable oxygenate proposal:

Petroleum consumption in the U.S. transportation sector is, and will likely continue to be, at the root of compelling environmental and economic concerns for the nation as a whole. For these reasons, there is wide consensus that the development of competitive, environmentally benign, domestic renewable resources is desirable (some would say urgent) and would yield significant societal benefits. It is also widely recognized that policies specifically aimed at promoting renewable technologies may be appropriate and necessary, given that significant market barriers stand in the way of a transition from our current, fossil fuel dominated energy economy.

That was the NRDC.

The Senate letter to Administrator Browner argues against the proposal on two grounds: environmental impacts and the effect on the taxpayers. The concerns raised in the letter cannot stand up to close scrutiny.

The very premise used by EPA to justify issuing this proposed regulation is the determination by EPA that the proposed rule will improve air quality and create domestic economic benefits.

The State and local air pollution association cited in the Senate letter sent its own letter to Administrator Browner in January stating:

The intent of the association's [January 14] testimony was to raise several potential air pollution issues that we believe warrant consideration, not to imply opposition to the proposal \* \* \* STAPPA is in no way opposed to the use of ethanol or the extent of its role in the RFG program.

So, let there be no mistake about it. The association clearly has argued in as unequivocal way as possible, that it does not oppose the use of ethanol or the extent of its role in the reformulated gasoline program.

Contrary to the assertions made in the letter regarding the potential impact on taxpayers, the proposed rule will likely save American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by reducing the need for farm support payments. The Department of Agriculture has estimated those net savings to the taxpayer at over \$500 million annually.

I do not think anyone should be misled, Madam President. By reducing the costs of the farm program there will be a direct and positive effect on the budget—the same budget that we have

debated in this Chamber for the last week. There is a big difference from the \$340 million in costs asserted in the letter and the \$500 billion annually committed to deficit reduction that the General Accounting Office and the Department of Agriculture agree will result from this program.

So, again, no one should be misled. When we look at the environmental consequences that will result from this renewable oxygenate requirement, and those associations who are reported to oppose this particular plan, when we look at the costs associated with implementing that plan, this year and every year hereafter—it becomes clear that the facts are on our side.

I encourage my colleagues who signed this letter to reflect on the facts of this debate and reconsider their position with respect to the EPA proposal. The proposal means a great deal to the economic health, not only of the Midwest, but of the national as a whole. It represents a small, but significant step toward bringing domestic renewable fuels into the mainstream of American energy policy—a step which I welcome and will continue to support. I hope that a review of the record will lead my colleagues in this body to join me in working to achieve that objective.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### RENEWABLE FUELS

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague from South Dakota. I know the Senator from Montana has been seeking the floor. I will be as brief as possible.

Madam President, we have had a long-time debate on this issue of cleaning up the environment, cutting oil imports and encouraging domestic production of clean, renewable fuels. It has been an ongoing debate here in the Congress for a number of years.

I thought we had resolved this issue in the Clean Air Act of 1990, when we put a provision into the bill that required that oxygenated fuels would be used to help clean up the air in this country.

The Senator from South Dakota was the sponsor of that amendment, which I cosponsored. It was supported here, overwhelmingly—69 Senators voted in favor of adding oxygenated fuels in reformulated gasoline. It was supported in the House. It is now part of the law.

That provision had two effects: First to help clean up the air, and to help promote a domestic renewable fuel industry. At that time Congress anticipated that ethanol would play a role.

Since that time the oil companies just have not let up. They have been trying to subvert this intent of Con-

gress ever since. But we also had some efforts by the Bush administration with regard to reformulated gasoline that were not quite clear.

Last fall the Clinton administration, I thought, finally put this issue to bed when they issued a proposed rule in December that would mandate that at least 30 percent of oxygenated fuels must be from renewables. That comment period closed on February 14 of this year. We thought it was over and done with, that EPA would then issue that rule that would provide that at least 30 percent of those oxygenated fuels would be from renewables.

Then we get hit with this letter yesterday, sent by my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, to the Administrator of EPA, Ms. Browner, asking that they not implement the rule.

First of all, the comment period closed on February 14. I submit if Senator BRADLEY and others did not like the proposed rule, they should have put their comments in before the end of the comment period. Everyone knew what the comment period was. So I see this as an effort to torpedo what has already been agreed upon in all sectors.

But beyond that, the letter of Senator BRADLEY contains egregious errors of fact, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out. I would like to address those factual errors.

First of all, studies have shown—and no one disagrees with this—that ethanol cuts carbon monoxide by at least 20 to 25 percent. Everyone agrees with that. That is not even in contention. And yet the Bradley letter says that this mandate of EPA would increase carbon monoxide. I am sorry, Senator BRADLEY, but that is just the opposite of what the facts are. No one would dispute the fact that ethanol decreases carbon monoxide. Yet, in his letter, the Senator says ethanol increases carbon monoxide.

Second, Senator BRADLEY says ethanol increases greenhouse gas emissions; that is, CO<sub>2</sub>. That is not true. According to the latest Department of Agriculture estimates, ethanol decreases carbon monoxide, the main greenhouse gas, by 27.5 percent. Again, indisputable. These are facts. Again, Senator BRADLEY states just the opposite in his letter.

Finally, Senator BRADLEY says ethanol increases "volatile organic"—I assume he means volatile organic compounds. Again, that may have been true under the previous Bush administration proposal but not under the Clinton administration proposal. The Clinton administration's proposed rule says we will use ETBE, which is an ether of ethanol, during the summer months. What that means is that we will cut down on volatile organic compounds because the ethanol ether, ETBE, has a Reid vapor pressure of 4 psi. Gasoline has an RVP of about 12 psi. MTB has a Reid vapor pressure of

8 psi. You can see, using ETBE in the summer, we cut down on the emissions of volatile organic compounds.

So, on the facts, the letter sent by my colleague, Senator BRADLEY, is just absolutely, totally wrong, and yet states that ethanol increases pollutants and greenhouse gases as though these were facts. That is not so at all.

Senator DASCHLE has responded on the claim that the EPA rule would be a drain on the Treasury. Senator BRADLEY says in his letter:

Under the EPA mandate, this industry—

I assume meaning the ethanol industry—

will drain the U.S. Treasury and Highway Trust Funds of an additional \$340 million annually.

Not so, absolutely not so. The fact is that under the proposed EPA rule, the actual tax subsidy would cost \$180 million a year, not \$340 million. That is just the actual subsidy. As Senator DASCHLE pointed out, corn deficiency payments by the Government would be reduced by \$580 million a year in 1998 and by \$740 million a year by the year 2000. The net savings to U.S. taxpayers: \$500 million a year. Of course, Senator BRADLEY does not point that out in his letter.

Lastly, I think Senator BRADLEY in his letter tries to imply that the use of ethanol and its ethers are not supported in the fuel industry.

Madam President, here is a copy of a magazine called Fuel Formulation, the January-February 1994 issue. Right here on the inside cover it states: "ETBE, the Right Road to Reformulated Gasoline."

This is an ad put out by ARCO Chemical, a gasoline refiner, saying ETBE has higher octane, and it has lower Reid vapor pressure so they can use it in the summer months.

So progressive-minded oil companies are looking at ethanol and its ethers as a formulation to use in the renewable fuels gasoline program.

I thank the Senator from Montana for allowing me to follow on the heels of the remarks made by Senator DASCHLE. This letter by Senator BRADLEY simply is an effort to torpedo the fine work that has been done by the Clinton administration, by the EPA, and by others to do two things: Clean up our environment and, secondly, provide for a domestic renewable fuels industry. The EPA proposed rule will do that, and it will do it in the best interest of the environment; it will cut down on the cost to taxpayers of farm subsidies; and it will put us on the path of increasing a domestic renewable fuels industry in this country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS, pertaining to the introduction of S. 1887 are

located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### UNITED STATES-JAPAN CELLULAR TELEPHONE TRADE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to commend the President of the United States on his firm action on cellular telephone trade with Japan. This Nation and Japan are good friends. We are not only friends but allies. That relationship is based on great respect for the Japanese people and admiration for their hard work and their commitment to excellence. That mutual respect has seen us grow together as countries for the last four decades. Our two countries see much of the world in eye-to-eye fashion and have worked together for world peace and economic progress globally. Nonetheless, we also have differences.

One of those differences relates to a United States trade deficit with Japan of \$59 billion. Part of that, let us acknowledge, is the result of the excellent efficiency and high quality products produced by Japanese workers. But it also is a reflection of unfair and unbalanced trade rules. The simple fact, Madam President, is that currently Japan has closed their market in many ways and erected many non-tariff and tariff barriers that do not exist against Japanese products entering the United States.

The reality is quite clear. They have chosen to sell into our market which has very few restrictions, if any, and have chosen also to leave very tough restrictions against American products in a number of areas.

In 1989, this country and Japan reached an agreement on cellular phones. It was one that was meant to address a small piece of that imbalance by expanding United States opportunities to sell cellular phones in Japan.

That agreement has been violated in the opinion of the administration. Resolution of that difference has been the focus of our recent negotiations with Japan. It is unfortunate for both sides that they were unable to reach an agreement.

I wish to commend the President of the United States for not agreeing to a faulty solution. His willingness to stand up, to insist that the Japanese must live by their agreement should be applauded by all Americans, whether Democrat or Republican.

The simple fact is this country's leadership has not been willing to insist on equal access to the Japanese market. The President's steps, although small and dealing only with a portion of the total market are to be applauded and deserve very strong bipartisan support.

It is reported also, Madam President, that this morning the President of the United States is considering reinstituting by Executive order a provision of our law called Super 301. The 301 provisions dealt with specific sectors in which trade is unbalanced. The Super 301 provisions gave us additional powers to deal with countries that erected a wide range of major barriers to our products.

Madam President, I support the President's efforts to reinstitute Super 301. It is the minimum that we ought to be doing to address the problems. I wish to assure the President of the United States when he acts to reassert Super 301 that he will have strong Republican support for an effort to make sure our friends around the world trade fairly with the United States.

Ultimately, a good arrangement and a good friendship with Japan must be based on mutual respect and mutual access. The idea that the United States should remain a pushover forever is simply illogical. A sound relationship with Japan can only be based on mutual trade and mutual market access. For the United States, acting like a rug while other nations walk all over us is simply foolish. In the long range, such a policy will not develop better, stronger relations with our friends. If we stand up for American industry and American workers by insisting on fair and equal access to world markets, we will gain respect, not lose it.

Is it going to be easy? No. But we must convince the Japanese and our other trading partners that the United States insists on fairness, insists on equal access, and that the days of the United States as a pushover in world trade negotiations are over.

There are stories on the wire which suggest that Japan and South Korea and perhaps another country will object to our reinstituting Super 301. They may well make appeals to GATT or to the World Trade Organization, if we do institute Super 301. That is a little like a mugger complaining to the police when a victim objects to being beaten up. Other countries will make a mistake if they think the American people will not stand behind the President of the United States on these actions.

For too long, we have been willing to live with unfair rules and unfair access. I for one want to assure this body and the President that if he acts today, he will have very strong bipartisan support that runs deep through the Senate, the House and through the entire Nation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Madam President.

#### EPA'S RENEWABLES PROPOSAL

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, the effort by some in the Senate to derail the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] proposed rule for a renewable oxygenate requirement is a mistake. Unfortunately their letter to EPA Administrator Carol Browner calling for withdrawal of the renewable requirement proposal will not help lead us to better environmental policy.

The EPA's renewables proposal is the direction we need to go as a country. The rule is completely in tune with the intentions of the Clean Air Act, and it would represent an historic marriage between clean air policy and renewable energy progress.

The EPA worked very hard and carefully to craft a rule that will improve the quality of our air while also promoting energy security goals and benefiting our domestic rural economy. The comments the EPA has received during its rulemaking process—and the oil industry has had every opportunity to participate fully—may lead to minor modifications to improve the rule. But it is basically sound, and it should be finalized in close to its current form.

Last month Dick Wilson, who is Director of EPA's Office of Mobile Sources and is the EPA official most responsible for this rule, visited Marshall, MN. He was accompanied by John McClelland, an energy economist from USDA. We held a public forum there, and over 500 farmers and rural residents turned out; 500 farmers gave the EPA a standing ovation at that meeting, and I believe that may have been as historic as this new rule; 500 farmers who gave a standing ovation to "bureaucrats" from Washington, DC.

The feeling in Marshall was due to the fact that this administration is acknowledging, through this rule, that ethanol represents what rural America needs to do; that is, utilize our own domestic, renewable resources in a way that supports farm income, creates rural jobs, and yes, protects the environment. In Marshall we have a very successful farmer-cooperative ethanol processing facility, one of several already operating in our State. The day after our Marshall event, I attended a groundbreaking for yet another farmer-cooperative ethanol plant in Winthrop, MN.

I am telling you something, Madam President. I have not been at a farm gathering for half a decade where I have seen as much hope for people that there can be a market for this clean fuel; that would be good for agriculture, good for rural communities, and good for jobs. This is not just an economic issue for people in rural America. They are looking for a signal from Government that they are not out of sight and out of mind, and that they are going to get a fair shake.

This is the effect this rule is already having in the rural Midwest. It is giv-

ing hope to farmers in rural communities, and they are investing their own savings, their own savings, in this hope, in the hope of sustainable economic development which ethanol represents.

This rule is about more than what portion of reformulated gasoline might be made of ethanol when the RFG program goes into effect next year. This rule has become a symbol for whether or not the Government will be attentive to the rural people in our country, to the concerns and circumstances of the lives of rural people in America. Rural America is helping itself, and it is only asking that the Federal Government take rational steps to coordinate environmental—we have worked hard with environmentalists—and energy progress with sustainable economic development.

Key statements in the Wallop-Bradley letter are mistaken.

The letter claims that a renewable requirement would add unnecessarily to clean-fuel and taxpayer costs. But new USDA analysis concludes there would be "no additional cost" associated with blending ethanol into reformulated gasoline. Several Government studies have shown ultimate savings to taxpayers from incentives for ethanol production. This is due to the farm price and job creating consequences of producing our energy domestically.

Worse is the letter's claim of the absence of environmental benefits from using ethanol—I say this as a strong environmentalist—and a vague warning of possible adverse environmental effects. No evidence is presented for such claims. Again, new USDA analysis conducted specifically for that Department's comment on this proposed rule demonstrates striking energy-efficiency advantages for ethanol, especially when compared to gasoline refined from petroleum and methanol from natural gas. Combined with its known clean-burning properties, this makes ethanol our premier clean fuel.

I note that most signatories to the Wallop-Bradley letter represent big oil-producing, big-oil refining, and big oil-import-harbor States. A quick look at the League of Conservation Voters scorecard shows that they had an average environmental voting record of about 48 out of 100 last year—with a letter that professes all these environmental concerns. Because of the letter's errors, I do not believe contributes to good clean-air policy.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

#### SENATOR MURRAY FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am happy and proud to be able

to speak in the Chamber being presided over by the distinguished Senator from Washington, and I wish her a good day and continued remarkable service to her people.

#### THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, just over a month ago, President Clinton came here to Capitol Hill not just to tell America what the state of the Nation is but to deliver a message to us from America in no uncertain terms.

Basically, our health care system is in absolute crisis, and we here in Washington are expected to fix it. The American people want us to fix it, expect us to.

Amazingly, there is still debate about whether we can get the job done. I am astounded by that. I am offended by that. I sit and observe in sadness as people nit-pick health care while not putting out comprehensive plans of their own, as the President and Mrs. Clinton have done.

Madam President, there should not be any doubt about the fact of the crisis. Eighty-one million Americans are paying more or cannot get insurance, or are locked into second-rate jobs because they have what the insurance industry brands as a "preexisting condition." Fifty-eight million Americans lose coverage for some part of each year. Today, 700,000 Americans who have health insurance will lose their health insurance. Another 70,000 tomorrow, 70,000 did yesterday, all hard-working, tax-paying citizens. But they will lose their health insurance. It is not their fault, but their tragedy.

One million Americans are forced to stay on welfare. We hear a lot of talk in this country which is antiwelfare. Well, to those who say that, I would say a million of those folks on welfare would not be on welfare, and do not want to be on welfare, but have to be on welfare because we have not passed universal health insurance coverage, and if they go to take the jobs which they have been offered and would want to take, they would have no health insurance in those jobs. Therefore, having children, they have made a moral decision that having health insurance coverage for their children under Medicaid is their parental responsibility. If everybody had health insurance, if all employers provided health insurance for their employees, then 1 million people who are on the welfare rolls would immediately disappear from the welfare rolls. To me, that is an amazingly wonderful prospect. But we cannot do that unless we pass comprehensive health care reform.

Americans are being run ragged by health care costs. Our spending on health care is out of control. I have said 5,000 times in the last 5 years that we are spending \$1 trillion—it was less

before—this year; and in less than 6 years, we will be spending \$2 trillion on health care. That is not sustainable; everybody knows that. We have chief executive officers of corporations coming before our Finance Committee saying, "We have excellent managed care programs in our company, we think; yet, we find our health costs are doubling every 6 years."

(Mr. CAMPBELL assumed the Chair.)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. If any one of us tried to sell this health care formula we have, which is to spend more and more money for less and less dependable care, we would be laughed right out of every shareholders meeting and business office in our country.

It is mind boggling to hear anybody argue with a straight face that our health care system is not in crisis. Doctors do not argue that. Consumers do not argue that. Certain people who do not want health care to pass argue that. There is a lot going on for us in the health care system; no doubt about that. We have great doctors, wondrous technology, and miraculous advances—but all for fewer and fewer Americans. And too many who turn to our health care system come out physically better but financially and emotionally devastated. That is what is taking place in the towns, counties, and States that we are here to represent—the State of Colorado for the Presiding Officer, and this Senator in the State of West Virginia.

Take the experience of Keith Stevens, who is a young West Virginian, a 21-year-old car salesman. He makes a reasonable income. Yet, he had to use his Christmas bonus to pay for his daughter's medical care because he cannot afford insurance and the company for which he works does not provide insurance. Yet, he earns too much for his children to qualify for Medicaid. So Keith would be described, I guess, as lucky because he did have a Christmas bonus that helped him—if you call spending Christmas money on doctor bills lucky.

But that is not the point. What is important is that a hardworking young father, married and with children, cannot afford health insurance for his family when he is doing everything right, as he understands it, under the American system. You play by the rules, work hard, pay taxes, do your best with your family and your children, and our system in America rewards you. That is true—but not in health care. More than all the frightening statistics and all of the frightening stories that we and the Presiding Officer could lavish upon this Chamber, that is what is out and out wrong with our system today—that good people like Keith Stevens, willing to pay their fair share and play by the rules, are forced to worry all the time about how to get health care for their family.

If you ask the American people and really want to listen to their answers

and what they are saying, they will tell you loud and clear: Fix the health care system.

Over 80 percent of Americans want the Federal Government to fix the health care system. Fix it because it is too costly, too undependable, and too laden with unfair rules in favor of big insurance companies; fix it because it tilts heavily against most American families; fix it because it is driving families and businesses to bankruptcy, and it is keeping parents and seniors awake at night worrying that they cannot afford to meet basic medical needs—and they worry with good cause—fix it because the country can and should do better when it comes to something so absolutely critical and personal and universal as health care.

Doing better must mean the ability to feel secure about health care. We, as a nation, are the standard by which the world measures its prosperity and its achievement. As various countries around the world strive to improve themselves, we are the standard; we always have been as long as I have been alive, and we still are. We have universities that are the envy of the world. We have opportunity which is the envy of the world. People have come to our shores not for incidental reasons, but because they feel that in America they can find success and make themselves better.

Our industries, Mr. President, drive the global economic engine. Yet, alone among modern countries, superior though we are in all economic manner, we cannot somehow find a way to give our citizens secure health care. We should not tolerate those who have made the political calculation that this Congress cannot stand up to special interests and stand up for hard-working American families in need of a strong hand to help them get and keep health insurance.

Americans know the President is fighting hard to give them peace of mind. They do know that. They do not really know what is in the Cooper bill. They do not really know that there is a Cooper bill or a Chafee bill. The polls show that. They do know there is a Clinton bill, and they know that the President cares about it and that the President wants to make health care better. But they do not know exactly what is in the bill. They do not know that the changes they are demanding are in that bill. I happen to know that they are.

Our people are frustrated that the information they need about the President's plan is being drowned out by two things, the least important of which is that there is a multi-million-dollar television commercial blitz, paid for by the insurance industry. And they are doing what they ought to be doing to protect their hides, but, in the process, they are creating enormous doubts about everything in health care. So

that no matter what comes out from what person or political party, the American people are now predisposed to be doubtful about it actually helping their personal situation.

Second, I think people are being confused and discouraged, because nobody has found a way to talk through the filter of the media, which treats health care and each day's events in Washington in health care like a horse race. They want to know who has won and who has lost. When I am approached by reporters, they are not asking: What is it about alliances that the American people need to understand? They are saying: So and so said yesterday that a certain percentage of American people have said this about American alliances and, therefore, the prospects of health care passing are less than they were yesterday. What do you have to say about that, Senator ROCKEFELLER?

In other words, it is an attempt to try to get some little scoop. It is a media filter. Most of the media does not understand health care itself. Some of it does. I have been astounded, as the founder of something called the Alliance For Health Reform—which is nonpartisan and backs no single health plan, but does back health care reform—by some of the trips I have made with my Republican colleagues to parts of this country, where health care reporters come before us and we give them a presentation, and they ask questions which basically show that they have no idea about what is going on in health care.

It is sad, but it is true. That is the reason that our alliance is putting out enormous volumes of manuals, books, and loose-leaf binders which help explain to reporters what health care is about.

Mr. President, I am going to do something in one paragraph which you will not think possible. I am going to explain to you, in one paragraph, how the President's health care plan works.

The Clinton plan will give every American guaranteed private insurance that can never, ever, ever be taken away. The Clinton plan guarantees that it is people who will choose their health care coverage and their doctors, not insurance companies. The Clinton plan preserves Medicare, alone among other plans, and improves benefits with prescription drug coverage and a start on long-term care, which seniors and others who need long-term care—the 40 percent who are younger than 65—long for. The Clinton plan saves money for families and businesses by limiting how fast premiums can rise. And, since both businesses and individuals benefit from the reforms and from health coverage, both employers and employees share the responsibility and cost of coverage.

End of paragraph.

We cannot go through committee meetings, hearings, and debates here

on Capitol Hill with an excuse-a-day to put off health care reform or to put off another trillion dollars. It should be all too clear that business as usual is what has brought us to this crossroads in the first place. Given that, we must reform the American health care system and we must do it, Mr. President, this year. We cannot do it incrementally. We must do it all whole cloth.

We must and we do have the political knowledge and the political courage to do that. Democrats on this side of the aisle, Republicans on that side of the aisle, underestimate—all of us—our political courage. We do that constantly.

I just came from a Finance Committee hearing on benefits in which Senators were basically saying we cannot say "no" to anybody. Mr. President, you and I have been in public life for a while. We spend a whole lot of our time saying "no" to all kinds of people.

Of course, there are 1,100 health care trade associations—read lobbyists—registered in Washington to give tender loving care to the President's health care bill. There is no doubt in my mind that I have the courage to say "no" to any one of them, to any scores of them, any hundreds of them, if they are trying to push on us something which is unrealistic, unaffordable, and which does not make a health care plan work properly for our people.

Enough of this weighing health care reform as a political calculation. Enough of this knowing in your heart that we need health care reform, that the American people want it. They deserve it. We all have family members and friends who have aching conditions of health care insufficiency which, in our hearts, we know we want to reform, but then somehow conclude that we do not have the will to stand up to the special interests to create the reform to bring that about. Again, alone among all modern countries in the world, America, Mr. President, with 70,000 people who have health insurance, losing it every single day.

In conclusion, Mr. President, enough of even thinking about squandering this chance to pass health care because special interests and partisanship magnify the critical nature of one's vote. Oh, yes, this is a vote which will be critically analyzed, and it ought to be. It is a broad vote to critically analyze because it is one of the most important votes any of us will ever make in our public lives. Health care reform is exactly the place to surprise all cynics, to surprise the obstructionists and simply do our job.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ROBERT C. LOUTHIAN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is my privilege today to recognize and commend the many contributions made by one of the Senate's most talented and distinguished staff advisers, a native of my own Commonwealth of Virginia, Robert C. Louthian.

Having served longer than any other individual in the Office of Legislative Counsel of the Senate, Bob is preparing to embark on a well-deserved retirement. Two years ago, I had the pleasure of congratulating Bob right here in this Chamber as he celebrated 40 years of service; today I am pleased to reiterate my appreciation for his dedication and accomplishment as we—the U.S. Senate—bid him farewell for a well-earned retirement.

While we are fortunate in the Senate to have the assistance and counsel of many outstanding support staff, few careers are as exceptional as Bob Louthian's. His experience, knowledge, wisdom, and judgment are evident in the major legislation he has drafted over these many years. He has crafted the language of legislative efforts as diverse as Indian affairs and shipping, communication, and energy. Our paths have crossed frequently as he advised the committees on natural resources. Indeed, all Senators have had Bob's invaluable experience and guidance through his service as senior legal adviser to Senate offices.

Born in Roanoke, VA, Bob Louthian attended that city's public schools. He and I share a common military experience: We both joined the Navy at an early age in World War II. Bob, however, saw active duty in the Pacific theater while I simply went to school. And, following his discharge, he returned to Virginia to enroll in Roanoke College. He earned a B.S. in economics in 1949, then pursued his legal studies at my own alma mater, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA. At Washington and Lee, he began to demonstrate the exceptional abilities that would characterize his professional career: He served on the staff of the Law Review and was elected to the prestigious Order of the Coif in recognition of his academic and leadership achievements.

The Senate is truly fortunate that Bob Louthian chose to join the ranks of those who make our mandate workable immediately after law school. He accepted the position of law assistant in the Office of Legislative Counsel on July 14, 1952. Two years later, Bob was promoted to assistant counsel and, in 1973, he achieved the rank of senior counsel.

Throughout his tenure, Bob Louthian has served not just the Senate or the Congress as a whole—he has served the

best interests of the United States of America. Moreover, he has done so in so many ways, large and small. His career has been marked by professionalism, insight, and a keen understanding of the legislative process. His efforts have been of invaluable help to every Member of the U.S. Senate for many, many years.

Bob Louthian stands as an example for all to emulate in the realm of public service. I know that my colleagues join with me in applauding his excellence, commending his commitment, and wishing him well as he departs. His record of achievement will long be remembered in U.S. Senate, and I know that he will continue to serve his community and country in his future endeavors.

#### WTOP RADIO

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join others today all across the greater Washington metropolitan area in saluting Washington's own radio station, WTOP, as it celebrates 25 years of all-news broadcasting. Today WTOP will be honored with a gala celebration, hosted by the CBS radio network, featuring such illustrious news figures as Walter Cronkite, Sam Donaldson, and Connie Chung.

WTOP, which first signed on as WTRC broadcasting from Brooklyn, NY in 1929, gained its current call letters 1943, when it became affiliated with CBS. The station is now owned by the Dallas-based Evergreen Media Group. WTOP has been honored with the prestigious Edward R. Murrow Award for excellence in news broadcasting.

In particular, I would like to recognize and commend the outstanding contributions made by a newsman from whom I and many of my colleagues have the highest regard: WTOP's one and only Dave McConnell. Dave is the Capitol Hill correspondent for the station and the host of "Today on the Hill," an excellent program which opens up and clarifies congressional action—Senate and House, floor and committee—to the people in our greater metropolitan area of the Nation's Capitol. Dave's program has aired since 1981, making lively and interesting stories out of congressional actions which often seem baffling and ponderous to others. The success and longevity of this popular program are due to Dave's knowledge, insight, and articulate presentation. He truly is a student, if not a professor, in some ways.

Dave McConnell's success reflects his lifelong fascination with Capitol Hill. From his boyhood days, he always enjoyed visiting the galleries and dreaming of someday covering our actions as a reporter. Those of us who serve are indeed fortunate that Dave's dream came true.

Recognizing that not everyone who listens to his program understands the

somewhat arcane complexities of the legislative process, Dave always takes care to turn dry facts and somewhat confusing language into enjoyable and informative, accurate—and I underline "accurate"—unbiased, fair, and objective listening. Best of all, he tempers his well-told stories with his own brand of keen wit and humor.

As we all know, many people come and go on the Hill, especially in the media. Dave McConnell has hung in with all of us for many, many years. He belongs to a small and admired cadre of dedicated broadcasters who devoted most of his career to broadcasting.

To WTOP and to Dave McConnell, I am pleased to offer my congratulations for a job well done and every best wish for many years to continued service.

I thank the Chair and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WHITE HOUSE ETHICS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, according to Webster's Dictionary, the word "independent" means, "not subject to control by others; not looking to others for one's opinions or for guidance in conduct."

I cite this definition because the last time I checked, the Resolution Trust Corporation is supposed to be an independent agency—underscore the word "independent."

But, in light of recent press accounts, it appears I may have to do some more research, or Webster's may have to revise its definition.

Last week, we learned that Robert Altman, the Acting CEO and No. 2 political appointee at the Treasury Department, met with White House political officials, allegedly to give them a "head's up" on the RTC's civil investigation into Madison Guaranty.

This morning, I think in a bit of damage control, there was a story in the Washington Post, front page story, "Treasury Officials Told White House Status of S&L Probe," told about other meetings. I think they did not want this to come out in some committee investigation so they somehow got it to the Washington Post.

Realizing his blunder, Mr. Altman subsequently and very belatedly, as pointed out in another column by William Safire called, "The Whitewater Coverup"—these are all today's clip-pings—recused himself.

Is that not great? We do not know how many contacts he has really had, we do not know who he has talked to

outside the administration—lawyers, maybe representing the White House, the President, whether he has talked to the U.S. attorney in Little Rock who recused herself after a late, late hour. So he recused himself from the RTC matter after almost 11 months. He finally understands it was bad judgment.

Today, we read that top officials of the Treasury Department, after the supposedly independent RTC asked the Justice Department last year to investigate possible criminal activity involving Madison, met twice with members of the White House Whitewater brain-trust—Bernard Nussbaum, big key player in the Watergate investigation years ago; Bruce Lindsey; and Mark Gearan; and who knows who else. According to news accounts, the Treasury officials gave the White House staffers a report on the status of the RTC's investigation and informed them that the President and Mrs. Clinton were named in the RTC referral, though not accused of any wrongdoing.

Needless to say, the average American citizen who was either named in a RTC criminal referral or subject of a RTC civil investigation would never have received such high-level cooperation from the very people charged with conducting the investigations.

You cannot tell me somebody from Colorado or Kansas could get that treatment if they had a RTC matter pending. They would bring all these people down and give us a "heads up." No, it would not have happened.

So, a dangerous pattern seems to be emerging.

During last year's Travelgate fiasco, overly eager White House staffers raised eyebrows by pressuring a top FBI official to attend a White House "political strategy" session, allegedly to coordinate a press response to the burgeoning number of media inquiries. Unfortunately, the supposedly independent FBI went along with this charade—and I always thought the FBI was independent—in changing an FBI press release. They changed the FBI press release to suit the White House political needs.

I have never heard of that before as long as I have been here.

Today, White House staffers are adopting a similar ploy, saying there was nothing wrong with Treasury-White House meetings: We were told that they were simply sessions to coordinate responses to press inquiries, and now belatedly again "Mack" McLarty, the Chief of Staff, has issued a memo: You cannot do this anymore. All this time, after all the news: You cannot do this anymore because they have caught us. Do not do it anymore.

That brings me to another word. We have defined the word "independent." Let us take the word "judgment."

In light of recent news reports, it is becoming increasingly clear that good judgment is in short supply among

White House and top administration officials. No doubt about it, you are asking for big, big trouble and showing some stunningly bad judgment when you start mixing politics with law enforcement. It is only fair to excuse a misstep or two. We all make mistakes. But when bad judgment becomes the rule rather than the exception, and when those involved will not admit their own mistakes, it may be time for a little White House housecleaning.

Finally, a third word comes to mind—"coverup." If the White House has nothing to hide about Whitewater—and that is what they have been saying for months; that is what they said in the campaign: Nothing to it, just a little transaction—then why all the meetings? Why all the panic? Why all the behind-the-scenes machinations? Why negotiate a subpoena to shield Whitewater documents from public scrutiny?

The public cannot get access to the Whitewater documents because they negotiated this subpoena several months ago now. So the public is shut out. And why put yourself in the dangerous position of being charged with compromising what are supposed to be independent civil and criminal investigations?

Coverup is a tough word, but the consequences of a coverup can be even tougher. Many of us learned this in the Nixon administration, in Watergate. One of the prosecutors there was Mr. Nussbaum. You would think he would have learned that lesson and would be out saying: We cannot do this. And look what happened to the Nixon administration. He apparently is teaching a course on how to do it, if you can get away with it.

Mr. President, I do not know what to make of the recently disclosed White House RTC-Treasury shenanigans, but I do know Congress has an obligation to ensure that supposedly independent law enforcement agencies are just that—independent. And for Congress to punt on its oversight responsibilities is a disservice to the American people and exposes Congress to the charge that we are willing accomplices—we do not care; we do not want to have any hearings; we do not want to hear what was referred to as a "nonindependent counsel" this morning by William Safire in the New York Times.

We have had the chairman of the Banking Committee say: Well, after the independent counsel finishes his work, whenever that may be, then if we are not satisfied—"if," that means if the Democrats are not satisfied—then we might look into it with a congressional investigation.

So we are at a loss. We are the minority party. We know if Republicans had the White House, there would be 15 hearings going on right now—maybe not 15, maybe a half a dozen. They would be every day, every day, every

day—drip, drip, drip. And we have already asked the Congressional Research Service to take a look at the last 12 years. We found about 20 hearings conducted when Republicans had the White House and Democrats controlled the Congress. They could not wait to have congressional hearings. But now we are told, with a solemn look: Oh, we cannot do this. We do not want to interfere with the investigation.

We have oversight responsibilities. We do not know how else to proceed, in the minority. We only have one thing we can do and that is to block nominations, to try, to hope the Democratic leadership will do what they should do and have a full-blown hearing without compromising anything that any independent or nonindependent counsel might do.

So we have, 43 of us out of 44, written to the distinguished majority leader yesterday to say we are going to object to proceeding to the nomination of Ricki Tigert, President Clinton's nominee to chair the supposedly independent FDIC, unless the Senate Banking Committee has an opportunity to thoroughly examine the RTC's handling of its civil investigation into Madison. I think today's shocking revelations only serve to underscore the need for such an examination, and more broadly, for hearings on the entire Madison/Whitewater affair.

I did not pick out too many clippings today, but I have already referred to two—the New York Times, "Whitewater Coverup"; Washington Post, "Treasury Officials Told White House Status of S&L Probe." The New York Times, they did not do much, "Justice Official Is Questioned About Billings at Rose Firm."

Washington Post, "Hillary Clinton's Role in Lawsuit Appears Larger."

Washington Times, "Prosecutor to Re-examine Foster Suicide Ruling."

Washington Post, "Hubbell Confirms Questioning, Asserts Innocence."

Washington Times, "Hubbell 'Denies' Rose Firm Probe." "Altman Gets Close to the Heat. White House Surprised by Billing Questions."

These are just a few of the clippings in papers we get in our office. It seems to me the media is also belatedly beginning to focus on what I consider to be a very important matter.

But when will Congress act? When will the majority—it has been reported in the Safire column that the House has been told by the Speaker: No hearings under any circumstances, any time.

It seems to me that may—that is borderline.

So I think there is no way we can have a rehearing on the nomination of Mr. Hubbell, or Mr. Altman. There is no way we can do that to check that.

But, I ask unanimous consent the letter be reprinted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOLE. And I ask unanimous consent that stories and commentaries from today's Washington Post, New York Times, and Washington Times, be printed in the RECORD as well—not the entire stories, but the headlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOLE. I suggest we have been very quiet on this issue, at least this Senator has, since last year.

It seems to me, though, that sooner or later Congress is going to have to examine this if we are going to have any credibility ourselves as an institution. We have responsibilities. We cannot pass them all off to the independent counsel. We have not done it in the past. We can come out and give some fine legal argument. The American people do not understand that.

We have oversight responsibility. We exercise that responsibility time after time after time, and it seems to me that sooner or later, this is going to become an issue and it should not become an issue. We are not asking for anybody's head, we are just asking for hearings. We are asking for hearings. We are going to be asking our colleagues, why should we not have hearings? The Democrats chair all the committees. They are not going to get out of hand. They control the staff. The Democrats control every agency in town, every Cabinet office, the White House. I do not think it is too much to let the minority in this case, the Republicans, to explain to the American people, or bring out the facts so the American people can make a judgment. Nobody has made a judgment. We are not about to make a judgment. It is not my purpose to make a judgment. But it is our responsibility to try to obtain the facts. And if the majority says you cannot have the facts, we are not going to have any hearings, we do not care what happens, OK, they are the majority, they have the votes; they have 56, we have 44 and we will have to resort to whatever we can.

I do not have any problem with Ricki Tigert. So I apologize to her. If she can give me some other way we can go or if we can have hearings, that nomination would not be held up 1 minute.

#### EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE, WASHINGTON, DC. MARCH 2, 1994.

Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. LEADER: We are writing to inform you that we will object to any agreement seeking consent to proceed to the nomination of Ricki R. Tigert, President Clinton's nominee to chair the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, until the Senate Banking Committee has an opportunity to thoroughly examine the Resolution Trust Corporation's handling of its civil investigation

into Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan.

As you know, the Acting Chief Executive Officer of the RTC, Roger Altman, recently disclosed that he sought a meeting with White House officials to give them a "heads-up" on the RTC's investigation. Needless to say, such a meeting is highly improper and raises very real questions about Mr. Altman's impartiality and the alleged independence of the investigation. Specifically, why were Harold Ickes and Margaret Williams present, in addition to White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum? According to the *Washington Post*, Mr. Ickes the Deputy Chief of Staff, is responsible for Whitewater "damage control." Ms. Williams, Chief of Staff for Mrs. Clinton, had previously participated with Mr. Nussbaum in searching Vincent Foster's office and sending all or some of the materials to David Kendall of Williams and Connolly who is representing the President and Mrs. Clinton.

We believe public hearings are required to explore these and other questions involving the attendance of political operatives at the White House in briefings by the head of a supposedly independent agency on matters that have nothing to do with the Executive Office of the President.

We regret having to delay the Senate's consideration of Ms. Tigert's nomination. Nevertheless, the American people deserve to have confidence that the RTC conducts its important business in an independent and impartial fashion. A Congressional hearing is an appropriate forum in which to examine the important ethical and regulatory issues raised by the Altman-White House meeting.

Sincerely,

Alfonse D'Amato, Paul Coverdell, Bob Dole, Malcolm Wallop, Phil Gramm, Judd Gregg, Larry E. Craig, Trent Lott, Dan Coats, Connie Mack, Conrad Burns, John McCain, Robert F. Bennett, Kit Bond, Ted Stevens, Lauch Faircloth, Bob Packwood, Arlen Specter, John H. Chafee, Jim Jeffords, Al Simpson, Jesse Helms, Don Nickles, Mitch McConnell, Orrin Hatch, Strom Thurmond, Thad Cochran, Pete V. Domenici, Hank Brown, Mark Hatfield, Larry Pressler, Bill Roth, John C. Danforth, Chuck Grassley, Bill Cohen, Dave Durenberger, Slade Gorton, Richard G. Lugar, Bob Smith, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, John Warner, Dirk Kempthorne, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

#### EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 3, 1994]

"HUBBELL 'DENIES' ROSE FIRM PROBE"

"ALTMAN GETS CLOSE TO THE HEAT"

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1994]

"HUBBELL CONFIRMS QUESTIONING, ASSERTS INNOCENCE"

"TREASURY OFFICIALS TOLD WHITE HOUSE STATUS OF S&L PROBE"

"HILLARY CLINTON'S ROLE IN LAWSUIT APPEARS LARGER"

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1994]

"JUSTICE OFFICIAL IS QUESTIONED ABOUT BILLINGS AT ROSE FIRM"

"WHITEWATER COVER-UP"

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I listened to the President last night talking about the reason the health care plan is losing supporters is because all these

"special interest groups are spending millions and millions and millions of dollars." How much has the White House spent? How much has the administration spent? They have been at this a year. How much have they raised? How much has the Democratic National Committee raised from big corporations?

They had a list in last week's paper, a big list, of big business giving money on health care. Before the President says anything about all these little Harry and Louise ads, I think we ought to add up the total.

The last time I looked, the first amendment said you had a right to express your views in America. Just as President Clinton does, just as Senator DOLE does, just as anybody in this Chamber does. People opposed to this plan have a right to express their views. It would be nice if they did not have any money and they could say there is not anything wrong with this plan. There are a lot of things wrong with this plan. The plan is in the terminal stage right now, at least in intensive care.

So I hope the President will give the American people more specifics about the plan. You cannot do everything for everybody, add new entitlement programs for early retirees, long-term care, prescription drugs and tell everybody in America you are going to get more and say it does not cost anything, you are going to save money. That is the judgment we have.

We are going to go off this afternoon, 33 Republicans, and we are going to have a conference this afternoon and tomorrow. We do not have any intention of coming out with a plan but we are going to see how close we can come. It is still my hope—as I said yesterday, I worked on a lot of bipartisan measures on health care over the years—it is my hope we will end up with a bipartisan measure and we will stop arguing about whether it is a crisis, a serious problem, this or that, some little nit-picking thing.

We will talk about how do we make it work, how do we take care of people who do not have the coverage now, how do we pay for it, who wins, who loses and how can we do it on a bipartisan basis? Maybe we cannot. Maybe the time will come in September, October, November when we just have to have 2 votes, but I do not think every Democrat supports the President's plan, not every Republican supports every Republican plan. We have plans, the Democrats have two or three plans. I think the American people would like to see us come together. We hope we can make some contribution today and tomorrow in our Republican conference. The primary purpose would be to go out, do our best, write down everything we agree on and disagree on and then start working in the areas of disagreement. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

#### WHITEWATER AND MADISON GUARANTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to take a few minutes of the Senate's time to outline for my colleagues where we are in terms of the ongoing disclosures with the White House, the Resolution Trust Corporation and the Treasury's activities regarding Madison Guaranty and related issues.

As my colleagues know, Madison Guaranty was a Little Rock savings and loan which was owned by James McDougal, the business partner of the Clintons in the Whitewater real estate deal. Madison Guaranty was a classic S&L story of insider dealing, reckless loan policies and ultimate failure with the U.S. taxpayers picking up the tab. But in this case, there is a small twist. Many of its benefactors were in politics and Government.

The tangled web of Madison and Jim McDougal has led to two criminal referrals by the RTC, an ongoing civil action investigation by the RTC, a conflict of interest case for the Rose law firm and a trial, which is about to start, concerning David Hale. It has also led to the appointment by the Attorney General of Special Prosecutor Robert Fiske, who is looking at all these issues to see what happened, who was involved, who benefited and was there a coverup.

In the middle of all this action, as has been noted by our distinguished Republican leader, Republicans in the House and Senate have been attempting to get the facts, not to interfere, to impede or to delay the investigation, but in order to fulfill our obligation of oversight of those who are now running the Government. This means asking questions of the RTC, the FDIC, the OCC and others about whether they are receiving outside pressure; is this White House staff attempting to get information that these so-called independent agencies would never give to anyone else? Is this information being provided? If so, by whom and to whom?

As my colleagues know, it was in the course of asking these questions, questions some of my colleagues do not believe should ever have been asked, that we first discovered from the acting head of the RTC, Mr. Roger Altman, that he had briefed the White House staff on the status of the RTC investigation. For those of you who are saying stay out of the way, the special counsel is on the case, perhaps you would be interested to know that this meeting took place 2 weeks after Mr. Fiske was named.

Mr. President, let me tell the Senate about this episode which should go a long way toward explaining why the Republicans signed and sent a letter to the majority leader that Senator DOLE has just outlined.

When Mr. Altman was before the Banking Committee on February 24, I asked him a series of questions about how he and the RTC had been handling the case. Given the sensitivity of the case, with the President and the First Lady having been named in a criminal referral by the RTC regional office, I asked Mr. Altman:

Are there special measures taken in the resolution of a failed thrift when you find it to be affiliated with a high-profile individual, someone in Government, for example?

Mr. Altman replied:

The procedures, Senator, which the RTC follows are intended to be identical in each case; and they certainly have been identical in the case discussed this morning.

He went on to say:

When the possibility of criminal referral was brought to me, I took one step. That was to instruct all the relevant RTC personnel to handle criminal judgments in the same exact fashion that they would handle any other PLS matter with no deviation whatsoever.

I should note for the record that Mr. Altman answered these questions before he had divulged the meeting at the White House in February. I should also point out that in the course of this discussion with me when he was assuring me and the Senate that the RTC was treating the Madison case in an identical manner and that the staff should treat the criminal referral in the exact same fashion with no deviation whatsoever, that Mr. Altman did not at that point see fit to tell us about how they had not followed the exact same or identical procedures. But it only gets worse.

Later in the hearing, I asked Mr. Altman:

When did you become aware of the RTC recommendation that further criminal prosecution be taken against Madison?

Mr. Altman replied:

Last fall, I was advised that a question of referral to the Justice Department was under consideration at the RTC and, as other members of the RTC will attest, I said that normal procedures with no deviations whatsoever should be pursued, including chain of command in terms of reaching that conclusion.

I then asked him:

Were you aware that the regional office had asked the national office to make a determination as to whether the Clinton's names should be in the new expanded referral?

Mr. Altman replied:

No, I was simply informed that this issue was on the table, and my reaction was, and I only had one conversation about it, the normal procedure should be followed. That is the way we are going to handle it from beginning to end.

I then asked:

How was the White House notified in the referral?

Mr. Altman replied:

They were not notified by the RTC, to the best of my knowledge.

I then followed up:

Nobody in your agency, to your knowledge, advised the White House staff that this was

going to be a major—this could be a major source of concern?

Mr. Altman replied:

Not to my knowledge.

Now, Mr. President, what we have just heard is the repeated assurances that the RTC did nothing different in the Madison case from any other case, that the head of the RTC had instructed his people from the moment he was aware of Madison's new criminal referral to treat the case no differently than all others.

But we now know that this story is simply not true. Not only did the head of the RTC brief the White House staff—and I believe it bears repeating—but by briefing Mr. Bernie Nussbaum and Ms. Maggie Williams, Mr. Altman was briefing the very people who stand accused of taking Whitewater-Madison files out of the late Mr. Foster's office and then attempting to conceal that they existed. These files are certainly ones that the RTC's own investigators would want to review.

But now we find out that at least two additional meetings were held, both late last year, as the RTC was putting together their second criminal referral.

According to the Washington Post article—and this was confirmed to me by Mr. Altman by telephone last night—Jean Hanson, the general counsel of the Treasury—and I assume acting counsel of the RTC at the time—briefed Mr. Nussbaum in late September and told him that the Clintons would be named in the criminal referral.

The second meeting occurred in October and again included Jean Hanson plus two other Treasury political appointees and was held in Mr. Nussbaum's office. Also in attendance, according to the Post, were White House Communications Director Mark Gearan and the designated White House spokesman, Bruce Lindsey.

Before the meeting, Hanson was briefed by RTC senior Vice President Bill Roelle.

Mr. President, something is very wrong. Either Mr. Altman deliberately misled the committee, which I do not believe he did, or the political appointees beneath him deliberately failed to inform him or to correct the misimpression left by him in his testimony when the Secretary of the Treasury came before the Banking Committee the next day or prior to last night.

Mr. Altman has recused himself. It is better late than never. And the President's Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, has now laid down the law. No more meetings. Again, better late than never.

But this is something that should not have to be stated explicitly. Has Ms. Hanson recused herself? After all, she has had three meetings. She is the general counsel and chief lawyer of the Department of the Treasury.

Did she suggest to Mr. Altman that a February briefing was in order? Did she

set up other meetings that have not yet come to light? Why was she involved in the first place? Is it true that she has been acting as the general counsel of the RTC as there is no one currently in that position?

As I stated in the committee, we now have five examples of what it takes for Presidential appointees in this administration to see conflicts of interest and bow out. They have to be caught in the act.

Mr. President, for those of us in Congress who work with the administration on a daily basis, trust is a very important commodity. Unfortunately, it is easy to lose and hard to regain, and the administration's handling of Whitewater-Madison has seriously eroded the trust of many of us in the body of the administration.

I believe the Senate owes it to the public to get to the bottom of this, and that is why I support our minority leader in asking for further hearings.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized.

#### GRASSLEY AMENDMENT TO GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. During debate, Mr. President, on Goals 2000: Educate America Act, I introduced an amendment, which the Senate adopted, to address an issue of concern to many of my constituents. The amendment was a culmination of over 2 years of research on the invasion of student and family privacy that might be taking place and is taking place in schools around America.

I have dealt with people in 25 States who feel that their family's privacy has been invaded by intrusive surveys, analyses, and other evaluations. These surveys ask very personal questions of children without their parents' knowledge or consent.

During debate on the Goals 2000 bill, I came to this floor with such examples from 14 different States, some of which I discussed and the rest of which, Mr. President, I just placed in the RECORD for easy referral by people who are interested in pursuing this.

Because the weight of evidence is so overwhelming, the Department of Education suggested a possible compromise to the amendment that I originally introduced. I pursued negotiations with the Department. We reached an agreement that, quite frankly, met many of my concerns. And since it met so many of my concerns and since the Department of Education and their representatives were so forthcoming and up front and honest in their negotiations. We put that compromise together, and that amendment was adopted 93 to zero before we passed Goals 2000.

Subsequent to this Senate's action on that amendment, the House Education and Labor Committee voted on identical language as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was taking place in the Education and Labor Committee. That debate was held the same afternoon my amendment was adopted.

In introducing the amendment during the markup on the House side, Representative ARMEY of Texas stated that the Senate-passed language would be a positive change in the elementary and secondary education bill. He said it would also send a very clear signal to the conferees on the Goals 2000 bill regarding the House committee's reaction to my amendment and the compromise that was worked out between me and the Department of Education.

So I was pleased when the House committee supported the amendment by a vote of 38 to 4. That vote was an affirmation of the good balance that I struck with the Department of Education in our negotiations on this side.

Despite that balance struck and the overwhelming support in Congress—38 to 4 in committee on the House side, 93 to zero on the Senate side—I regret to report now that there may be—and I wish to say “may be”—ongoing efforts to undermine our agreement with the Department of Education.

In my hand, Mr. President, is an internal memorandum from the Department of Education. It represents a proposed revision of the Arme amendment by the Department of Education. It so happens that this proposed language is exactly the same proposal that the Department brought to me in our initial negotiations on Goals 2000. I speak of what is floating around the Hill now and the language that is written at the bottom of this page, and I will not go into specific detail what that language does. But we rejected this language. The negotiators for the Department of Education were very pleased with the negotiations that we worked out.

So the suggested comment on this internal Department memo regarding the Arme amendment is exactly the position that I, the Department, and 92 of my colleagues put to rest when we reached the final compromise.

The fact that this language is suddenly resurfacing is troubling to me, and it should be troubling to each and every Member of this body who voted for my amendment.

I must point out that this language is not yet an official Department position. It is merely being passed up the chain of command by wily bureaucrats in the bowels of Education.

But that is why I indicated the agreement may be undermined. It is not yet a fait accompli. After all, I am confident that the Department would not want to be accused of saying one thing out of one side of its mouth and an-

other out of the other. You see, I do not believe the Department, once it discovers that this language is floating around the Hill—in other words, once Secretary Riley and Mr. Cohen, who negotiated for him, see this language floating around the Hill—will do the bidding of some bureaucrat down there in the Department that does not like the agreement that was reached in the Senate.

That would be double dealing. It would be a bait-and-switch approach. You do not survive long in this town with that sort of an approach.

So I am hoping, Mr. President, that my being here on the floor this afternoon is a false alarm. Because I am hoping that this position paper will never see the light of day, that it will be put to rest once more as we agreed here in the negotiations before we adopted my amendment 93 to 0, and before we passed the Goals 2000 bill. I am confident that the honorable thing will be done and that the department will adhere to its agreed-to position.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support the amendment in conference as passed by the Senate 93 to 0, and I hope that the Department of Education continues to work with us as we seek broad consensus on education reforms.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I do not see any of my colleagues seeking the floor. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DORGAN). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Presiding Officer, I would like to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I wanted to talk a little bit about health care and respond to something the President said yesterday about the declining popularity of his proposed health care plan. I will also talk about the meeting or retreat which Republicans begin this afternoon and will continue until tomorrow, in our effort to try to come up with a united position on health care reform.

Let me first talk about the President's health care plan. I believe that

support for the President's plan has declined every day since it was made public by him in a very excellent speech to a joint session of Congress. The President yesterday attributed that decline in support to special interests. I believe the decline in support is more basic than that. Not only has support for the plan declined every day since the public first heard about it, but the polls have consistently shown something that I think is very important, which is that the more people know about the President's plan, the more likely they are to oppose it.

Let me just try to summarize what I think is right about the President's plan and what I think is wrong about it. What I think is right about the President's plan is that there are parts of America's health care system that are broken. We can fix the system and make it possible for people to change jobs without losing their health insurance. Every one of the proposals that has been made to reform health care, every single bill—those offered by Republicans; those offered by Democrats—has had a provision that would make it possible for people to change jobs without losing their health insurance.

I believe the President is right that people should be able to buy health insurance that can never be taken away and cannot be canceled. I remember growing up in the fifties. My mama bought an insurance policy and paid on it 4 or 5 years. She had a major ailment, and the insurance company paid for the first episode of medical care and then immediately canceled. What good is health insurance if you do not have it when you need it? The good news is that while that happened a lot in the fifties, it rarely happens today. But the point is that it ought never happen. We can fix that.

I believe the President is also right that we need to do something about excessive paperwork and we need to do something about the regulatory burden. But the paradox is that while the Government now pays 31 percent of the medical bills and generates two-thirds of the paperwork, the President would have us believe that if we turn the whole system over to the Government, somehow the paperwork and regulatory burden will disappear. I do not think people believe that.

We need medical liability reform. The President touches on it in his bill. I do not think it is a very dramatic change to limit contingency fees to 30 percent, every other health bill proposed has had a more comprehensive medical liability provision than the President's. But I agree with the President that there is a problem and in fact a crisis, depending on who you are and the status of your health care.

I have never gotten into this silly debate about whether there is a problem or whether there is a crisis in health

care. I think whether there is a problem or a crisis depends on who you are and what your circumstances are. Certainly, if you are in the process of changing jobs and you find out you or somebody else in your family is very sick and you have lost your health insurance in that transition, that is a crisis. If you are worried about paying the Nation's bills and you look at the exploding cost of Medicare and Medicaid, if it is not a crisis, it is close to it.

There clearly are problems. The point is—and where I differ with the President—is that I believe we can fix what is wrong in the American medical care system without destroying what is right. If our objective is to try to help every American get health insurance, why would we want to destroy coverage for the 85 percent of all Americans who now have it in order to try to help the 15 percent who do not?

I think where the President's plan gets off track—and where it has lost public support—is that while the President talks about access and talks about universal coverage, the reality is that only 19 pages of the President's plan have anything to do with universal coverage. The other 1,323 pages have to do with the Government taking over and running the health care system.

I think where the American people have parted company with the President, and where Congress, Democrats and Republicans in Congress, are parting company with the President, is that we do not believe, and the American people do not believe, that having the Government take over and run the health care system is going to solve our problems. I believe the American people think that what we need to do is preserve the things about our health care system that we recognize as second to none: The quality, the access to the science and technology that have revolutionized American medicine and world medicine, and our right to choose. What we should do is change the system to help all Americans get and keep private health insurance; to make it possible for people who change jobs or who get sick to not lose their health insurance. But we should not force people out of the private sector into a Government health program.

Here are the things that I think represent problems with the President's bill and, to some extent, with the Cooper bill; and it is because the American public is recognizing these problems that I believe we are going to be able to first build a consensus among Republicans and then, hopefully, sit down with Democrats to try to work out a bipartisan bill.

I do not see a health care bill passing with 55 votes. I expect a health care bill to pass with 80 votes, and I expect it to pass with 40 Republicans and 40 Democrats, because I think, in the final analysis, we are going to decide

that we do not want the Government to take over and run the health care system; that we want to try to build on the strengths of the system and we want to try to fix the parts that are broken, but we do not want to tear down the whole health care system of the country and recreate it in the image of Government.

Where I think the President gets off track is when he attempts to limit people's freedom. Under the President's plan, if you do not work for the Federal Government and you do not work for a company that has 5,000 or more employees, your health insurance is going to be canceled. You are going to be forced to buy health care and health insurance through a Government-run cooperative that will be a monopoly buyer in your region.

The American people have looked at this, and I think they have rightly been concerned about a seven-member board in Washington, DC, that is going to dictate the principles under which health care will be practiced nationwide. I do not think it is because the President would appoint this board. I would not be happy with this board if we had the seven wisest people on Earth as members of it. I would not be happy with it if a Republican appointed them. I do not think any seven people ought to have that much power.

The idea that anyone would force people to give up their private health insurance I think is alien to the American character. I am against the President's plan not just because it will not work, but because it is at variance with the basic character of the American people to say to someone who has a good Blue Cross/Blue Shield or other insurance policy, who is happy with it, that they have to give up that policy and they have to then buy their health care and their health insurance through a Government-controlled agency, I think people reject that.

I think they also reject the idea that the Government ought to tell us what kind of insurance we should have. If the Government wants to provide information, if the Government wants to help make us wiser purchasers of health care by sharing information with us, I think people are for that. But I do not believe that people think the Federal Government ought to be telling people what kind of health insurance they need.

I think the American people believe that each family ought to have the freedom and flexibility to buy the coverage they want.

It is not a good idea to force everyone, for example, into a system where they are covered for alcohol and drug rehabilitation. Those are real costs, but in many States those requirements have driven up the cost of health insurance by 12 to 14 percent. The fact that we ought to mandate, as the President does, that every American be covered

for participation in encounter groups—I do not know what an encounter group is. It may well be that an encounter group is useful. The point is, to take just one scenario, if a healthy 26-year-old is married to a healthy 23-year-old and they have three little children and are not allowed to buy the insurance of their choice in case little Sarah has to have an appendectomy or in case Johnny falls down and breaks his arm, and they are forced into a plan with all this exotic coverage which costs them money and denies them access just does not make any sense.

We Republicans are going to meet in Annapolis this afternoon to try to come together and support a unified set of principles and ultimately later to produce a bill. We are not going to produce a bill by the end of this meeting. I think we all know it.

But I think what has happened as people reject the parts of the President's program that use the coercive power of Government to force people into the collectivization of health care purchases, is that the rejection of the President's plan has created the opportunity to bring both Republicans and Democrats together.

One of the main things that Republicans differ from the President on is the role of Government. Should we have Government set up these alliances, and control the purchase of health care?

The President's plan says if you work for a company that has 5,000 or fewer employees, your insurance is canceled and you have to buy health care through this Government agency. The Cooper plan says the cutoff point is 100 employees, that if you work for a company with 100 or fewer employees, your insurance is canceled and you are going to have to buy insurance and health care through these Government-run co-operatives.

My answer is that the magic number is not 5,000, and it is not 100. The magic number is 1. I do not think we ought to deny one American freedom to choose his or her own health insurance. If our objective is to help everybody get health insurance, why should we want to cancel the health insurance policies of the people who have health insurance today? I think that makes absolutely no sense.

So as we reject the idea that we should cancel people's health insurance and make them buy through mandatory Government programs, I think that is ultimately going to bring Democrats and Republicans closer together. I believe that the health care purchasing cooperative would be ineffective in any shape, form, or fashion, other than simply allowing free people through organizations or through businesses to pool voluntarily in an effort to reduce cost. But any element of mandated pooling, anything that takes away from people their right to choose,

that I am against. I believe ultimately when we vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate on these mandatory health care purchasing collectives which will force people to cancel their insurance, force them to buy through Government, and when we look at the President's extraordinary provision which provides a \$10,000 fine for anybody who tries to sell private health insurance in competition with the Government, that is not going to survive a debate or a vote on the floor of the Senate.

So I think a consensus can be reached when Democrats and Republicans catch up with the American people, reject mandatory purchasing co-operatives, and reject the idea of Government deciding what kind of health insurance people should buy. When we focus on the parts of the system that are broken, when we provide a workable plan so people can keep bridge coverage when they lose their jobs and retain their insurance until they get a new job, when we change the system to make insurance permanent, when we deal with medical liability, when we force the Government to reduce paperwork, when we allow free individuals and institutions to voluntarily pool to buy health insurance, and when we reform Medicaid and use the savings to give refundable tax credits to working moderate income people so they can buy private health insurance, then I think we are going to find a consensus on those issues. I believe the American people support those reforms.

So, the basic difference that exists among Republicans and among Democrats is really a difference about the role of Government.

The President believes that we should tear down the current system and start over. I reject that. I cannot see destroying the greatest medical system in history to start over and rebuild it in the Government's image.

What we need to do is take the parts of the system that are broken and fix them and we need an aggressive program to fix them. I do not defend the status quo. I did not create the status quo. There are many things about the status quo that I do not support, but I do not believe that we should be destroying the greatest medical care system in history with the idea that by having Government re-create it, that we will be improving it.

Let me also say that when some of my colleagues longingly look toward Canada as being an ideal place where medical care is perfect, it strikes me as somewhat paradoxical that nobody that I have ever heard of in the United States of America went to Canada to get health care. Yet I see Canadians who either have the money or have political influence come to the United States every single day to get health care.

So I would say, in conclusion, Mr. President, that I want to pass a health

care bill this year. There is absolutely no reason that we cannot dramatically reform the health care system to fix the parts of the system that are broken, to make the system more cost conscious, to make it more competitive, to make it more efficient. But we are not going to find cost consciousness in Government, we are not going to find efficiency in Government. We are going to find it by promoting price competition, by making consumers more cost conscious and more responsible for their own individual actions.

I am hopeful that Republicans in Annapolis today and tomorrow will come closer together, will agree to write a health care plan that builds on the principles we believe in—the right of people to choose, a belief that price competition promotes efficiency and economy. I am hopeful that as the American people, as they seem to be doing in their great wisdom, reject all the coercive Government bureaucracy in the President's program—that we can all come together, put together a bipartisan health care reform package, get 80 percent of the Senate to vote for it, and show the American people that we, in fact, can do the job they want us to do. I look forward to that.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has consumed 10 generous minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently in morning business.

Mr. LEAHY. Is there a limitation of time Senators can be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10-minute limitation.

The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### SNOW AND POTHLES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would note that the usual degree of panic has been expressed by the local governments and media and so on because they had, I think 2, maybe even 3 inches of snow—something we refer to as a dusting back home, unless it happens in July. I have heard a lot of stories, even editorials, saying the weather is terrible here.

I think one might justifiably ask the local governments if they could take a day or so to actually teach people how to remove snow. It is absolutely ridiculous.

I will not go into the usual bit about people who come barreling down the road, thinking they can stop on ice or snow, because that is obvious, and they have the car repair bills to prove it. I will not comment upon the District of Columbia using an outmoded way of repaving their streets. Something that has been turned down by every other city in the country is used here because, I guess, of a historic affinity for potholes.

I think the only way I could compliment those who are supposed to keep our streets clean is to say that they are very religious people. They have an abiding faith—faith that if God put the snow there, God and God alone will take it away. Because, God knows, they are not going to.

#### EXTENDING THE SATELLITE HOME VIEWER ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to assure the thousands of families in Vermont and the millions of households nationwide that their home satellite dishes are not going to go dark and that the Congress is not about to pull the plug on home satellite reception. I am going to do everything in my power to ensure that we pass the legislation necessary to continue home viewer access to satellite reception of television.

Where mountains and distances can interfere with over-the-air reception of network broadcasts and cable is not a viable alternative—and I can think of my own home in the mountains of Vermont, in a very rural area with houses about a mile apart where you are not going to have cable and the mountains interfere with reception—satellite technology has provided access to the information and entertainment available on television that those in a more urban area take for granted.

In 1988, we made possible the development of home satellite viewing by passing the Satellite Home Viewer Act. I am proud to have been a principal in the passage of that act. I am delighted that so many people in my own home State, who might not otherwise receive signals from the networks or the superstations or the special channels, now can through satellite viewing.

In fact, there are an estimated 35,000 satellite dishes in Vermont. To put that in perspective, Mr. President, we are a State of only 570,000 people. That is a pretty high percentage. In fact, some say that we ought to change our State flower from red clover to the satellite dish. I am not quite prepared to go that far. But if you go down any of the rural roads in Vermont—and there are many of them—you will see how much we rely on satellites.

Last year Senator DECONCINI introduced S. 1485 in order to extend the statutory copyright license that has made the development of the home sat-

ellite dish industry possible. The license provided by current law expires this year, 1994. Indeed, there are less than 120 legislative days left to us in this Congress to act on this necessary legislation. To date, the legislation has yet to be considered by either the House or Senate Judiciary Committees, let alone scheduled for floor action. With the extensive agenda we face in this legislative session, including health care reform, welfare reform and crime legislation—all things I and so many others want to go forward with—we should not delay our consideration of home satellite legislation any longer.

We are undercutting consumer confidence in the future of the home viewing of satellite transmission and raising needless concerns for our constituents, local distributors and satellite retransmission carriers. Home satellite technology has advanced to where the dish is becoming more affordable and about the size of a large dinner plate. This is hardly the time to allow congressional inaction to interfere with these developments that hold such promise for so many viewers in rural areas of the country.

In fact, the distinguished presiding officer comes from a State, a very rural State where—I know from my own experience and—the pleasure I have had visiting North Dakota—you see a number of satellite dishes as you go around that wonderful State.

I join today with my distinguished colleague from Arizona, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks of the Judiciary Committee to urge prompt consideration and passage of legislation designed to continue to make possible home satellite viewing of television by those in rural areas and those who opt to take advantage of this exciting technological opportunity.

By cosponsoring S. 1485 today I signal that I intend to make sure that the Satellite Home Viewer Act is extended without interruption. While the precise contours of the legislation will be improved by consideration and amendment, the fundamental purpose of my action today is to reaffirm that home satellite viewing will continue and the development of broadcast satellite technology and so-called wireless cable and other technologies should be encouraged and have access to signals in order to provide video programming and viewing alternatives that the public wants. The prompt consideration and passage of S. 1485 will provide an essential component of the legal framework that is currently needed if all of our constituents are to have increased opportunity to receive information and entertainment by way of television.

As we begin travelling the information highway we should extend to those in unserved and underserved areas, in remote locations and outside our

cities, the opportunity to see their government in action and their favorite sports team, a chance to see performing arts and international news developments, as they happen, and the capability to share in the harvest of information and entertainment that is before us.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator there are two minutes and 40 seconds remaining.

#### WTOP AT 25

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak about a radio station I listen to virtually every day. Do you know what Walter Cronkite, Connie Chung, Sam Donaldson, Bill Lynch, Eric Engberg, Jim Bohannon, Gary Nunn, Bill Diehl and Jamie Gangel have in common? Besides their reputation for being among the finest broadcast journalists in the business today?

They are all members of the distinguished alumni of Washington's all-news radio station, WTOP. I know that many of us listen to Dave McConnell's "Today on the Hill" program on our way to work each morning and his late night wrapup of the day's congressional action when we return home that night. A lot of times I listen to it late at night as I drive back home just to find out exactly what we did do during the day in the Congress.

Today, WTOP is celebrating the 25th anniversary of its all-news format. I am sure Charles Osgood will have something in rhyme to commemorate the occasion, but I would like to add my appreciation, on behalf of the Senate, for the tremendous public service performed by this great station.

Washington thrives on information. The Congress and the White House are often called upon to react to this information and we are dependent upon the integrity of those sources of information.

WTOP performs a great public service for the people of Washington and those who work on Capitol Hill. On behalf of the Senate and thousands of appreciative listeners, I congratulate WTOP as it marks its 25th anniversary as an all news station.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRESIDENT CLINTON

Mr. DORGAN. I have listened today at some length to discussion on the floor about a number of things. I wanted to come over and say a few words about President Clinton.

It is interesting that we have so many people running for President this early in the season that they are bumping into each other, driving these political cement trucks, careening from side to side of the road, not caring who or what they run into: Health care, Whitewater.

Let me say first about Whitewater, I do not know all the facts about Whitewater, but I know many of the facts about Presidential ambition. We are told that Whitewater is a massive scandal of some sort.

There is no alleged criminal impropriety by the President in Whitewater that I am aware of. These were not actions that were involved with the term of Mr. Clinton's Presidency. We were told by those who continue to raise this on the floor that there should be a special prosecutor; so there was a special prosecutor named. Now we are told that is not enough, there should be congressional committees investigating it.

I just wonder, as I listen to all of this, whether any helping of information or facts would satisfy the political appetites of those out here on the floor of the Senate with respect to Whitewater.

Next let me mention health care. I have not been a cosponsor of the Clinton health care plan. There are parts of that plan I do not agree with. But I will say this. This President has stepped forward and said this health care system needs fixing and I am going to lead the effort to fix it. I credit him for that, as opposed to previous Presidents who say: "What problem? There is no problem? Everything is just fine," while health care prices are increasing double and triple the rate of inflation every year, pricing American families out of the ability to get health care for their children.

Things are just fine?

They are not fine. We do have a crisis in health care for too many American families. I credit this President for saying this is an issue this Congress must address. Good for him.

For those who are having what is called a retreat this afternoon, I would say that is probably an apt description of where they are heading, a retreat. Because finally, this President through his leadership is bringing them, as well, into the discussion about how to fix this difficult problem.

## TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me turn to trade just for a second. President Clinton is also under attack for his position on trade issues with Japan.

Finally, I say, finally we have a President who is willing to exhibit a bit of leadership in international trade. We have had, year after year after year, trade actions by Japan and others that are fundamentally unfair to American producers, drive up enormous trade deficits in this country without anybody willing to stand up and say, "That's unfair to us."

Uncle Sam ought to stop getting kicked around in international markets. We ought not expect any special favors at any time, but neither should we accept unfair trade. When other countries decide they want to accept the opportunity in our market to send all their goods to us, then we ought to say one simple thing of them: We have a requirement of you to open up your market to our producers just as generously as we open up the American market to yours. That ought to be the standard for trade: Reciprocal trade and fair trade.

Finally, we have a President who is willing to stand up to Japan and others—good friends, allies, trading partners, yes—but to stand up and say we expect more from you, we expect your markets to be open to American businesses and American workers, and we expect to get our goods into your markets just as you flood our markets with your goods. That is a standard that every American should accept and every American ought to applaud this President for taking that leadership.

Let me turn to one other point in trade that we are trying very hard to get the White House to move on as well, and that is trade with Canada. Canada shares with us the longest border up North. We are good neighbors. We are good friends. But we have an enormously serious trade problem with the Canadians, and that is they are flooding our market with unfairly subsidized grain.

Most people do not know what durum is, unless you produce durum. The people who eat macaroni and cheese tonight will not know they are eating something produced from semolina flour. Semolina flour is the ground product of durum wheat. Eighty percent of the durum wheat raised in America is raised in North Dakota.

So if this evening you decide to have a pasta dinner, you are likely to put something in your stomach that comes from a durum wheat field in North Dakota.

When we had the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement before the Congress, our farmers were literally sold out by then Trade Ambassador Yeutter and by the administration. We had zero durum wheat shipped into our country at that point from Canada. Do you know what it is now? Twenty percent of domestic consumption—all of it—is coming in unfairly subsidized. None of it is trade with which we can compete—50 cents a bushel subsidy just

on the subsidized Canadian railroad alone. We cannot compete with it.

It is fundamentally unfair trade. It has sucked hundreds of millions of dollars out of the pockets of our farmers. It has cost us an extra \$600 million in added farm program payments, said the USDA, according to their own testimony.

The question is, what is going to be done about it? This President has taken the first steps to address it, but they are not steps sufficient enough to resolve the problem. And we are asking—yes, demanding—that this administration step up and say to the Canadians, "No more."

We want trade remedies called an emergency 22, emergency section 22, which would impose immediately a significant tariff on that unfairly subsidized grain. We are having a series of meetings with the administration. But you almost fall asleep over all these meetings and all these months when everybody says all these soothing things and nothing really quite gets done to solve the problem.

I am of the opinion that we probably will not need to confirm any additional trade folks, because we do not need more trade people working in any agency downtown if we cannot solve the trade problems we now have. We have some nominations coming up. I have talked to some people in the administration suggesting that if that is the only point of leverage, then we will have to use that.

We must resolve this issue with the Canadians and we must resolve it now. Our farmers deserve no less than to have the administration and Congress step up and say we will not accept unfair trade from our neighbors.

The Presiding Officer, who very ably chairs the Agriculture Committee, understands how arcane some of these disputes are and how difficult some of the issues are with respect to grain.

Most of the people in this Chamber—I should say most of the people in the other Chamber, in the House of Representatives—come from urban areas. Many in this Chamber grew up in urban areas. They do not have to live in a rural area in order to serve here. Those of us who come from rural areas have to live in an urban area to serve here. That is part of the requirement of serving in the U.S. Senate: You have to live at least part of the year in Washington, DC. We understand urban problems because we are forced to live here to serve here.

The reverse is not true. Urban Members of the House and Senate do not always understand the problems we have in rural America. We have very few people out there. They are important. Their livelihood is fragile, depending on the weather, depending on the price. If they get a crop, there might be a decent price from the harvest; more than that, depending on the trade rules, be-

cause we must find a foreign home for half of what we produce.

Trade rules are unfair to them. When you have trade rules that are as unfair as the rules have been with Canada, our farmers understand and are demonstrating in 30 degree below weather up on the northern border that this Government take action.

I talked with President Clinton as recently as 2 days ago about this subject. I implore him again that we need to take effective, immediate, and decisive action to respond to this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHELBY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE STATE OF HISTORY EDUCATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, which operates out of the Smithsonian Institution, recently reported a revival of the study of classical history and philosophy in the Soviet Union. Private educational institutions are being established there to study the humanities—although Soviet authorities have not yet permitted these schools to award degrees. The Wilson Center suggests that “the popularity of such ‘non-utilitarian matters’ as Greek and Roman classical works represents a clear breakdown of the ideological control Soviet authorities once exercised over education.” This is welcome news, and yet how ironic it is that the study of Western civilization seems to be bursting forth in the Soviet Union at the very time it has been declining in the United States.

The distinguished former Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Mrs. Lynne V. Cheney, had written about how tragic it is that Americans as a society no longer emphasize the study of history and literature in our schools. She pointed out that the study of history—which was part of every year’s curriculum when my generation attended high school—has generally now been reduced to a single year. And even within that single year, many State education systems have de-emphasized the chronological study of history in order to focus on more topical, social studies issues.

A provocative book, “What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?” by Diane Ravitch

and Chester Finn, Jr., argues that in our national concern over science and mathematics education, following the sputnik scare of the 1950’s, we turned our attention away from the humanities to the sciences and reduced history to just one of the “social studies.” They lament that as a nation we have lost any consensus about what authors should be read, what subjects should be studied. Standardized testing subsequently concentrated on verbal skills over literary knowledge and appreciation, and on mathematical equations rather than a sense of history. As a result, we have produced a generation of young citizens who have graduated from high school without having read Charles Dickens or Mark Twain, and who have not the slightest clue who Herodotus or Thucydides were. Many young people cannot tell when World War II was fought, cannot identify the Magna Carta; and cannot explain why President Washington was also called “General Washington.” And the only information they have about Abraham Lincoln is that—as I heard one young lady say—“he was shot.” We may well have produced a generation of voters who cannot understand what they read in the newspapers or hear on the media because they lack any historical reference points.

One newspaper columnist has written “In Praise of the Non-Voter.” Rather than being depressed that only half the eligible voters showed up to cast ballots on election day, columnist Doug Bandow took satisfaction on the grounds that people who do not know enough about the issues should not be encouraged to vote. “High school graduates these days have no idea where most foreign countries are.” He noted, “they have no sense of history and don’t understand economics.” I can agree with his assessment of the current state of history education, but I cannot subscribe to a cure that discourages voters. I would rather ensure that all citizens are educated sufficiently to carry out their responsibilities and preserve our democratic form of government. Every citizen must have some sense of history in order to make choices about today’s social, economic, and political issues.

Along these same lines, University of Virginia Professor E.D. Hirsch, Jr., has called for improvement of America’s “cultural literacy.” Professor Hirsch writes: “To be culturally literate is to possess the basic information needed to thrive in the modern world.” He argues that the cultural “illiteracy” of so many citizens is a result of the failure of our schools, which offer “a fragmented curriculum based on faulty educational theories.” Professor Hirsch not only believes that there is a national culture, but that it can and must be studied and mastered. “To teach the ways of one’s own community has always been and still remains

the essence of the education of our children,” he writes. He objects to “cafeteria-style education” and “the shopping real high school,” in which students randomly and arbitrarily choose what they will study amid myriad classes, many drawn not with the core curriculum but from passing fads and fancies. He believes that teaching children the “national mainstream culture” will help them to understand those values, but not force them to accept those values uncritically. Cultural literacy will place “a higher value on national rather than on local information,” and give students a greater breadth of view.

Professor Hirsch then offers a 63-page list of names, dates, places, events, and concepts that literate Americans ought to know. This list is probably what made his book a best seller, as readers who studied the list could then pride themselves on their literacy. Others have objected to such reductionist approaches to knowledge and literacy. Professor Fred Newmann, director of the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, spoke for those who felt we should “go for depth” of learning rather than limit ourselves to Professor Hirsch’s lists of specific background information. In response, Professor Hirsch admitted that he did not “love a list,” but was impelled to create one by the logical and practical constraints of trying to identify the core knowledge that all educated citizens should possess. His list, he hoped, would open debate about what that core knowledge should be.

Open—or at least contribute mightily to a debate he surely did. In the last few years both popular and scholarly journals have produced a literary avalanche of articles on what has gone wrong with our study of the humanities. The Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, designed to help States perform their history education, has proclaimed that the study of history fosters better “habits of the mind,” among them “critical thinking, acceptance of uncertainty, [and] appreciation of causation.” Professor Paul Gagnon, staff director of the Bradley Commission, testified that such books as “What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?” and “Cultural Literacy” have stimulated a much-needed review of history education, and also considerable opposition from those who fear that they will bring about a return to rote learning of facts and jettison “relevance” from the curriculum.

Professor Gagnon added his own prescriptions in an important cover-story in the Atlantic Monthly, “Why Study History?” “When Students, and School Boards Ask, ‘Why History? What Are We Supposed To Be Getting Out of This?’” He wrote, “the best answer is still that one word: Judgment.” Citizens need to possess a judgment guided and enlightened by history. Judgment

requires more than simply a civics lesson on the tools of government, it requires wisdom, a sense of tragedy, comedy, irony, and paradox—and history, biography, and literature, “if they are well taught, cannot help but convey them.” Gagnon tells us that history helps students develop a sense of “shared humanity.” History helps students to understand themselves and others, by showing their resemblances to people of different times and places. History helps students to question stereotypes. History helps students to distrust simple answers and to confront complexity in human action and motivation. History even helps students to recognize the abuse of historical “lessons” and other forms of misinterpretation and distortion of the past.

History is at its best when it pursues broad themes, but Professor Gagnon particularly faults American history textbooks for a lack of imagination in presenting these themes and the broad sweep of history. In recent years textbooks seem to be stripped of style, and devoid of any point of view. Trying to appeal to everyone and to offend no one, they may well have appealed to no one and offended everyone by their blandness. What a shame that is, because I still remember the vivid prose and sweep of the textbook that I read in high school, as a matter of fact, in Elkton in the elementary school, by David S. Muzzey, “History of the American People.” Since Muzzey, history textbooks have apparently lost their world view and make few comparisons with events happening outside of North America. In their rush to include the lives of “ordinary people,” they have diminished the stature of the leaders and heroes who once made history thrilling and inspired young leaders. Trying to become more democratic, they have lost much of their power to serve as educators of democracy.

These themes are repeated in various forms in such studies as Harriet Tyson-Bernstein’s “A Conspiracy of Good Intentions: America’s Textbook Fiasco,” Gilbert T. Sewall’s “American History Textbooks: An Assessment of Quality,” and the People for the American Way’s “Looking at History: A Review of Major U.S. History Textbooks,” as well as Professor Gagnon’s pamphlet, “Democracy’s Half-Told Story: What American History Textbooks Should Add.”

Now, it is worthwhile to mention that while these studies are uniformly critical of American history textbooks, especially on the high school level, they each have favorite books that they cite as better than the rest, and they do not at all agree on which books are the best. In other words, the situation is bad but not hopeless, and there are some good products available on the market.

Pick up any high school textbook today and you will notice immediately that it looks different from the books we read. Those of us who have lived a long time and others who have not lived so long will notice immediately that the history textbook of today looks different from the book that you read. For one, there are color illustrations on practically every page. In Muzzey there were none. There is nothing wrong with color pictures, particularly if they catch a student’s attention and imagination. I am very pleased with the handsome appearance of the color pictures in my own recently published “History of the United States Senate.” But I must admit a preference for colorful writing over colorful pictures. The real test of a textbook is in the words, the story, and the flow of the narrative. Thankfully, some books still tell a good story, but others read as if they were written by a committee—and most likely they probably were!

How did textbooks get this way? Part of the problem lies in the fragmented nature of our National Education System.

The United States has developed 50 approaches to education, and an even greater number when one considers the individual towns and counties and local school districts that direct education in their schools. When it comes to adopting textbooks, about half the States have some form of State-wide adoption. Under these systems, the individual State reviews the various textbooks that publishers offer and selects a limited number from which the various schools in that State can choose. If a book is not adopted, it cannot be purchased by the public schools in that State. Naturally, larger States like California and Texas, with their larger sales potentials, will influence the market far more than smaller States. Some large States, like New York, have a system of local option, leaving decisions to local school boards. Regardless of the merits of these State and local approaches, they have tended to fragment educational policies and leave textbook publishers in something of a quandary over how they can possibly appeal to so many different demands.

For many years, for instance, some southern States would not purchase books that employed the term “Civil War,” preferring, instead the euphemistic “War Between the States.” Textbook publishers complied by producing two different versions of their books with the appropriate nomenclature for each region. But issues of interpretation are much harder to resolve. How should these textbooks deal with the issue of slavery and reconstruction, when the north and south still, a century and a quarter after the Civil War, hold different interpretations? Other States have mandated

that textbooks adopt a multicultural approach to history, or emphasize the development of the free-enterprise system, or include references to a particular hero of that State. Moreover, the increased academic interest in social history has reduced the space available in textbooks for more traditional political and diplomatic history. More history is also devoted to women, African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Indian-Americans, each of whom has sought strong voices of advocacy in the textbook-adoption process. Taken on their own, these may all be valid requests, but put together, they certainly make it difficult for publishers to satisfy everyone and still retain their individual character and style. I wonder how Muzzey would have fared against such odds.

Mr. President, my ancestors came from England and so I suppose I would call myself an Anglo-American. But I think there are too many hyphenated Americans. Afro-Americans to me are Americans, and so are all of the other hyphenated Americans, if they are born in this country. I can be just as proud of my Anglo-American heritage as anyone else can be of theirs. But I am not a hyphenated American. I am not an Anglo-American. I am an American.

So that is the way I look at it.

Now, what is the answer? As a nation, Americans recognize that we have drawn our heritage from the contributions of men and women from all continents. Over the past decades, the lives and writings of individuals from all of these hyphenated groups have been incorporated into our traditional fields of study—and rightly so. But, I would agree with Ravitch and Finn that:

It is possible to define American history, with all its complexity, controversy, and variety, as the story of a people forged from many different pasts but joined together under a common political system. There is, in short, an American people—we ought to be proud of that—not just a mosaic of unrelated groups, each with its own story, disconnected from the whole.

Mr. President, from what I have been saying, I think it is obvious that I find history worth studying. History is exciting. It is flesh and blood. It is drama. It is enormously instructive. I can also attest that history is exacting. It requires research. It requires accuracy and precision. It requires analysis. It requires understanding and even empathy for those who went before us, and whose lives and deeds have so much to teach us.

A taste for history can become unquenchable. My own studies began with the institution of the Senate, and then led me back to our pre-history in the British Parliament.

Of course, as I already indicated, they began with Muzzey, but more recently my studies began with the institution of the Senate and then led me

back to our present-history in the British Parliament. From there I found myself reading about the Roman Senate and further back to the Greek democratic city-states. As a result, I have come to believe that Americans need more than a knowledge of their own history. Mainly, we should know American history. One needs a knowledge and appreciation of world history. Therefore, with regard to the debate over "Euro-centric" history and "Afro-centric" history, I would endorse "global-centric" history. We need to broaden our focus, not shut our eyes to the achievements and lessons from all parts of the world.

I find it strange, for instance, to identify ancient Greece as part of a "Euro-centric" curriculum, when the ancient Greeks had far more contact with the Middle East and Africa than with Europe. Moreover, many of the writings and lessons of the Greeks were preserved not by Europeans but by Arab scholars, from whom the Europeans eventually received back that lost heritage.

Why should American students study the Ancient Greeks? It was from the Greeks that we inherited our concept of democracy, and from whom we learned the wisdom of dividing government into different branches. In the Fourth Century B.C., Aristotle divided government into "three elements." The first was "the deliberative element," or the legislative branch, along with an executive branch and a judicial branch. Aristotle found it in the interest of a democracy that "the parts of the state should be represented in the deliberative body by an equal number of members," the formula that the Constitutional Convention adopted for the U.S. Senate. He recommended that the legislature be sovereign in such matters as war and peace and the making and breaking of alliances, in the enactment of all laws, and in the appointment of all magistrates.

Polybius, who lived from 205 B.C. to 125 B.C., spoke about a government with separation of powers.

He talked about the Romans, and their checks and balances.

Our Founding Fathers had the benefit of a classical education, and were well aware of such theories at the time they drafted our Constitution. To understand our Government today we, therefore, need to understand Aristotle, Lycurgus, Polybius, the Greeks, and the Romans.

The very concept of a historian comes from the Greek *historia*, meaning "to inquire," and a sustained inquiry was a *historia*. Herodotus was the first historian. He lived from circa 480 to circa 420, B.C.

Thucydides lived from circa 460 to circa 400, B.C. Herodotus lived during the Fifth Century B.C., and his account of the Greek war with the Persians is considered the first work of Greek history.

Herodotus tells us about the Persian Kings, about how Darius, of Hystaspes, was made king by the neigh of a horse. Thucydides followed shortly after Herodotus and appears to have been much influenced by him. Indeed, his story began where Herodotus's ended; and Xenophon's story picked up where Thucydides left off.

Xenophon wrote about the Anabasis, the going in to Persia by Cyrus the Younger, the brother of Artaxerxes II, and about the death of Cyrus at the battle of Cunaxa.

Thucydides tells us that his history is not easy to read "because of the absence in it of a romantic element." He was not writing in the style of Homer, with heroes and gods and monsters and daringly impossible feats. Instead, he wanted to write factual story of real people and nations engaged in a long war. He did not believe in knowledge for its own sake, but something that could be used. Thus, he wrote:

It will be enough for me, however, if these words of mine are judged useful by those who want to understand clearly the events which happened in the past and which (human nature being what it is) will, at some time or other and in much the same ways, be repeated in the future. My work is not a piece of writing designed to meet the needs of an immediate public, but was done to last forever.

Thucydides distinguished his own form of factual history from the "prose chroniclers" of his time, who he informs us, "are less interested in telling the truth than in catching the attention of their public," and "whose authorities cannot be checked." He might very well be describing the many "prose chroniclers" of our own day, who pass off rumors and gossip and unattributed "deep-background" quotes as gospel truth and offer no possibility of verification.

His history of the Peloponnesian War is the story of alliances, of mistrust, of military action, victory, retreat, and defeat, of fortifications and land and naval battles, of diplomacy oratory, and politics, of how small allies can trigger warfare between large powers, of how people can miscalculate their strength, miscalculate their enemies. He wrote of the love of power, of individual and communal greed and treachery, of violent fanaticism, even of politicians who tried to deny bad news by attacking the medium that brought the news. In short, although writing about the distant past, he was cataloging and analyzing human nature, which is timeless and universal.

Napoleon said, "Let my son often read and reflect on history; this is the only true philosophy."

Thucydides tells us that "war is a stern teacher." Centuries before George Orwell, Thucydides understood the politics of words:

To fit in with the change of events, words, too, had to change their usual meanings. What used to be described as a thoughtful

act of aggression was now regarded as the courage one would expect to find in a party member; to think of the future and wait was merely another way of saying one was a coward; any ideas of moderation were just an attempt to disguise one's unmanly character; ability to understand a question from all sides meant that one was totally unfitted for action. Fanatic enthusiasm was the mark of a real man.

How modern that sounds!

Mr. President, our students should be reading Herodotus and Thucydides and Polybius and Livius and Gaius Sallustius, Crispus, and Tacitus, and Zosimus, and Suetonius, and Gibbon, and others.

They should be studying particularly America's history and literature, and English literature and English history—the history of the British, the history of the people of the British Isles, which are today known to us as Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and England. And what history is more fascinating than the history of the Romans?

They should have enough time in their curricula to study all of those fields comprehensively and in depth.

Prof. Peter Stearns of Carnegie-Mellon University has urged that American history be taught as part of the "much broader historical panorama" of the world. More comparative history, more interaction between world and American history, more global perspectives, he reasons "will help students intelligently assess any claim to American uniqueness or to understand why foreign views of the United States—and its history—may well differ from their own."

I, for one, welcome the debate over our history education, and trust that its effects will be felt in classrooms all over this Nation. We must do all that we can to stimulate and support our educational system if we hope to produce new generations who are capable of carrying out their responsibilities as citizens with an appropriate sense of history.

I close with Cicero's words:

One should be acquainted with the history of past events. To be ignorant of what occurred before you were born is to remain always a child.

(Mrs. BOXER assumed the chair.)

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, EDDIE WALKER

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, from time to time in my daily life, I am privileged to encounter a man or woman who renders exceptional service in his or her work, who seems to have discovered in his or her work a special calling, who feels that no respectable job is demeaning and who believes that a big man can make a little job big, and who consistently leaves those to whom those services are rendered with the impression that such services were adorned with courtesy and performed with pleasure.

Such a man is Mr. Eddie Walker. Who is Eddie Walker? You have all seen

him. I am sure he has said hello to everyone here, whether or not they bother to respond by saying hello to him. He is the Lead Waiter with the U.S. Senate Restaurant's Banquet Department.

Edward Steven Walker started working with the Senate Restaurant on October 26, 1971—nearly 23 years ago—at the age of 20. He has spent more than half of his life working here for Senators, for the families of Senators, for tourists, for the general public, and for all of the people who work with us and for the Senate.

Eddie Walker seems to perform all of his assignments with a smile—something of a rarity in so many occupations nowadays. And he is always polite, and that is all too often a scarce commodity nowadays. His smile is one of those contagious expressions that makes its recipient feel better for having received it.

Ever dependable, Eddie Walker always seems to be here at 7 o'clock in the morning, and often stays late in the evening, sometimes until 10, 11, or even 12 o'clock at night, depending on the scheduling of special dinners, receptions, or banquets.

Regardless of the time of day that I encounter Eddie Walker, he seems always to have something kind or pleasant to say to me—something that further brightens my day or that makes me glad that Eddie Walker is my friend.

Madam President, I make a point of sharing these thoughts about Eddie Walker because this Saturday, March 5, is Eddie Walker's 43d birthday. Oh, to be 43 again!

On this occasion, I wish Eddie Walker the happiest of birthdays, and I know that I speak for all of our colleagues who have been recipients of Eddie Walker's unique graciousness, when I express this greeting to one of the people who makes the work lighter and every day a little brighter for all who are privileged to serve in the United States Senate.

So, Eddie,  
Count your garden by the flowers  
Never by the leaves that fall;  
Count your days by the sunny hours,  
Not remembering clouds at all;  
Count your nights by stars, not shadows,  
Count your life by smiles, not tears.

And on next Saturday afternoon,  
Eddie:

Count your age by friends, not years.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WTOP 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, today marks the 25th anniversary of Washington's only All-News radio station, WTOP. WTOP's reputation for presenting the news instantly and in an unbiased manner is well known. It sets a good example of providing the facts to its listeners without editorializing.

This is quite a milestone for the personnel at WTOP and I am sure that my colleagues and all join with me in wishing the personnel at WTOP many more years on the air.

#### TRIBUTE TO PAUL DUKE

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, this weekend will mark a real sea change for devotees of good political discussion. On Friday night, that is tomorrow night, Paul Duke will celebrate his last night as moderator of the PBS program "Washington Week in Review." I have known Paul Duke for many, many years. I have not seen him in a while face to face, and I will miss him.

Paul has been an institution in this town for over two decades and he has come to symbolize all that is good about the media's role in reporting the business of Congress and the White House. His ability to transcend the fray and present a balanced, fair, and decent program is legendary. Paul has never made himself the focus of the debate. He has always brought the proper combination of expertise and guidance, and graciousness to his role. As a result, Paul has set a remarkable standard. One that will not be easily repeated. It is my hope that his contribution to his profession will be remembered and that journalists will seek to emulate him.

I congratulate Paul on his great contribution to Washington and wish him all the best in his future plans.

The hours are like a string of pearls.

The days like diamonds rare.

The moments are the threads of gold.

That bind them for our wear.

So may the years that come to you (Paul).

Such wealth and good contain.

That every moment, hour and day.

Will be like a golden chain.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, as all Members of the Senate know, ordinarily the Senate would be in session well into the evening on today—a Thursday—and tomorrow as well. But

as I noted in earlier remarks to the Senate, the Republican Senators have a meeting today and tomorrow on health care, and the Republican leader asked me to change the schedule to accommodate Republican Senators for that meeting. I was pleased to do so. I applaud their attention to the importance of the subject of health care. As I also noted in my earlier remarks, Democratic Senators have had a number of meetings on this subject, and they will have a number of additional meetings.

My hope is that out of these respective meetings can come a genuinely bipartisan effort to reach agreement to reform our Nation's health care system. The problems that Americans face with respect to the cost of health care are neither Republican problems nor Democratic problems. They are problems that face every family, regardless of politics or political philosophy or persuasion. I believe it will take a genuine bipartisan effort, with our allegiance being first and foremost to the national interest, for us to resolve this matter and to reach agreement on what I hope will be a meaningful and bipartisan and comprehensive reform of our Nation's system of health care.

There are many things we must do. First and foremost among them, we must see to it that every American has private health insurance that cannot be taken away, health insurance that is permanent, noncancelable, and that travels with that person for life. No longer should Americans have to fear the loss of health insurance if they lose or change their jobs, if they move from one place to another.

No longer should a single American—a single American—have to choose, let alone the many thousands who now make the most basic decisions of life based upon health care considerations. Right now in this country there are thousands of people who decide whether or not to marry, whether or not to have children, where to live and where to work, based upon health care insurance and cost considerations. I personally have met with many such Americans.

I held a series of hearings around the country, and I was shocked to hear people tell me that they are either not going to be married or not going to have children solely because of their concern about health insurance and the cost of health care.

And, of course, we all know about the growing phenomenon of joblock, where millions of Americans have jobs that are not making the maximum use of their talents, and who could, in fact, and would like to have other jobs, but do not move because of their fear of losing health insurance. This creates massive inefficiency in a free-market economic system in which the highest level of productivity is when each person is working at the maximum level of talent which he or she has.

So there has to be health insurance for every American. There has to be control of cost. We cannot continue the escalation of health care costs that is occurring in this country, that has occurred over the past several decades.

Volumes have been written on it; books have been written on it; but one statistic tells the story. In 1960, Americans spent on health care in the aggregate \$27 billion. This year, Americans will spend on health care in the aggregate \$950 billion. From \$27 billion to \$950 billion. That is a rate of increase which cannot be sustained.

I know there are some who say the rate of increase has moderated a little bit in the most recent year or two and, therefore, ought not be a matter of concern. These are among the no-crisis exponents in our society who say this is not a crisis, this is not a real problem, we really do not have to do very much.

Madam President, Members of the Senate, I strongly disagree.

We must act. We must act this year.

I would like to make a final personal appeal on one subject which has been a matter of special consideration and attention for me.

Before becoming majority leader, I served as chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee, and I have been privileged to serve on that Health Subcommittee in all the years I have been in the Senate.

I became aware then and have become increasingly aware of the need for much greater emphasis on primary and preventive care in our society. One of the reasons Americans spend so much on health care is that we spend almost all of it trying to make people well after they have become ill. We devote very little attention, very little effort, and very little in the way of resources—and almost nothing in the way of education—in an effort to persuade people that it is in their personal interest to concentrate on wellness.

Healthy people do not need as much health care as people who are not healthy. That is so obvious it needs to be restated: We must undertake a major national effort at education, at prevention, to change the minds and attitudes and poor health habits of Americans, to concentrate our efforts on personal responsibility. Every person is personally responsible for his or her well-being. It is something that is so obvious that it is often not said. But we have to do a much better job, especially among young Americans, of encouraging them to discontinue poor health habits and to encourage the kinds of habits that will permit longer, fuller, more meaningful, and more healthy lives. We can save billions of dollars in the process, and although the examples are legion, I am going to take this opportunity to recite just one of them because I think it is an example with which every American can and should identify.

I have toured every health-care facility in my State, and I have been in many health-care facilities in other States. Some time ago, I was privileged to be taken on a tour of the Tampa, FL, General Hospital. It is a very fine community hospital in a large urban area with a diverse population. As I walked through the pediatrics ward, the chief pediatrician pointed to a row of incubators along the wall and said: "Senator, those are our million-dollar babies."

I said, "What do you mean by that?"

She said: "It is a term of affection, but the cost of keeping each of those babies alive has exceeded \$1 million. In the case of some of them, it is \$2 million or \$3 million."

I went over with her to the row of incubators and walked along and looked at each of those babies. Some of the parents were there, and I talked to some of them and I inquired about the histories of the babies and the parents.

They were different. This is a diverse urban area, but there was one common theme among most of them. Most of these babies were born of mothers who had received no prenatal care. In plain and simple English, many of these young mothers had not seen a doctor between the time they conceived and the time they gave birth to the child.

That ought to be shocking to all of us. I am absolutely certain that every single Member of this Senate would find it unthinkable, if one of their children became pregnant, that she would not see a doctor during pregnancy. For us, it would be unthinkable.

What is unthinkable for us ought to be unthinkable for every American family. It is unacceptable that what is unthinkable for us is the reality for many American families. It simply ought not to occur in America.

Every single American woman should know that if she becomes pregnant, she can see a doctor. The normal, reasonable, preventive measures that our children would take under similar circumstances ought to be taken by every pregnant American woman. This simply ought not to occur in our country, and yet it does with distressing frequency.

I have had many people say to me, "Well, there really are not that many \$1 million babies." Maybe there are \$800,000 babies, maybe there are \$400,000 babies, maybe there are \$100,000 babies. But the reality is this: The rate at which babies are born prematurely and of very low birthweight is markedly higher among women who do not receive prenatal care than it is among those who do.

That, again, is just obvious common sense. A pregnant woman who does not see a doctor, especially one who may not have a high level of education, who may not have a supportive, intact family, who may be frightened and under enormous social and economic pres-

sure, that woman is much more likely to have a child born prematurely of low birthweight, therefore requiring these heroic and expensive measures, than one who does not suffer from those pressures, who is not subject to those pressures, and who has the opportunity and the means to see a doctor on a regular basis and to have any problems taken care of, or, most importantly, to take reasonable preventive measures.

That is just one example, and there are literally hundreds of such examples, of how we can have a healthier society, a better society, and spend less money.

Would we all not be better off if there were fewer \$1 million babies or \$100,000 babies, whatever the figure? We would have healthier babies, healthier mothers, healthier families, a healthier society, and spend less in the process.

It is so obvious, it is so clear, the knowledge exists. The only thing lacking is the political will to do what we know must be done. And that is our task.

Each of us sought this office. Each of us worked very hard to get here. And once we get here, it is our responsibility to act in the national interest, not merely to serve in public office for the glory of being in public office, but to use that limited opportunity, the short time that each of us has in life overall and in public life to do something good and meaningful and positive and beneficial to the country. That would be the best legacy we could leave individually and as a Congress.

Our challenge this year—and it is a challenge that no other Congress has faced with as much opportunity in many, many years—is to pass comprehensive, meaningful health care reform.

Madam President, I commit myself to that objective. Again, I express the determination of the Democratic Members of the Senate to get this job done this year. We look forward to working with our Republican colleagues. We do not think we have all of the answers. We do not think our way is the only way. We welcome discussion. We welcome dialog. We welcome negotiation.

Let us keep our eye on the common objective that we share and not be divided by the differences on how best to get there. With good will, with determination, with commitment, and with a proper sense of what public service means, I am convinced we can reach that goal.

So I look forward to welcoming our Republican colleagues back to the Senate next week with a view toward sitting down and going forward and working together and achieving this important national objective. It is the most important thing we have to do. If we do it, we will have performed a valuable public service.

### SENATOR SPECTER ARGUES BEFORE SUPREME COURT

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise to commend my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], for personally arguing yesterday the case of *Dalton versus Specter* before the Supreme Court of the United States.

This case was originally filed by Senators SPECTER, WOFFORD, BRADLEY, and LAUTENBERG, as well as other Pennsylvanians, New Jersey, and Delaware elected officials and various unions, to protest the alleged violations of law in the procedures followed by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission [BRAC]. The BRAC recommended closing the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

Senator SPECTER argued that the Navy deliberately concealed from the BRAC certain information which argued for keeping the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard open. The argument before the Supreme Court yesterday focused on the question of whether the courts had any power to require that the BRAC follow the procedures outlined in the Base Realignment and Closure Act. Senator SPECTER argued that the Department of Defense had specifically violated the act's requirements that all information relied on in the base closing process be made available to the Commission, the GAO, and the Congress.

Senator SPECTER pointed out that a long line of Supreme Court decisions, from Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in *Marbury versus Madison* in 1803 to the *Youngstown* case involving President Truman's seizure of the steel mills in 1952, require the courts to determine whether the President and executive branch agencies have complied with the law.

As a sitting Senator, Senator SPECTER was not unique in appearing before the Supreme Court to argue a case. Daniel Webster and others did so frequently in the 1800's, and more recently Senators Ervin and Saxbe did so in 1972 in a case involving senatorial immunity.

This is not the first time Senator SPECTER argued before the Supreme Court of the United States. As a Yale law school graduate and district attorney from Philadelphia, he was last at the court in 1970.

Once again, Senator SPECTER has proven himself to be a skilled litigator as well as a tough fighter for the people of Pennsylvania.

### IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that it was, and is, the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending. Congress has failed miserably in that task for about 50 years.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,554,851,980,565.91 as of the close of business yesterday, March 2. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$17,470.89.

### MASSACHUSETTS ATHLETES IN THE 1994 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is a privilege to commend the 17 athletes and the 2 coaches from Massachusetts who earned the honor of representing the United States at the winter Olympic games in Lillehammer, Norway, last month.

All of these athletes and coaches deserve great credit for their achievements. The outstanding performance of Nancy Kerrigan was a profile in courage because of her extraordinary grace under extraordinary pressure. She skated into the hearts of our country and the world in winning the silver medal in figure skating, missing the gold medal by only the narrowest of margins.

I also particularly commend Eric Flaim, who won a silver medal as part of the Men's 5,000 Meter Short Track Relay Team and Karen Cashman, who won the bronze medal as part of the Women's 3,000 Meter Short Track Relay Team.

In addition, I want to pay special tribute to a native son of Massachusetts who is currently "on loan" to Yale University, the head coach of the USA Hockey Team, Tim Taylor. Tim, a former Natick resident, did an outstanding job in guiding Team USA to the medal round.

Massachusetts is proud of all our athletes who competed at Lillehammer. Their ability, their energy, and their dedication are inspiring examples to us all. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the members of the U.S. Olympic Team from Massachusetts may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of members was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE MASSACHUSETTS MEMBERS OF THE 1994 U.S. OLYMPIC TEAM

Women's downhill: Krista Schmidinger of Lee.

Women's giant slalom: Heidi Voelker of Pittsfield.

Women's slalom: Carrie Sheinberg of Lee. Freestyle skiing: Nikki Stone of Westborough.

Figure skating: Nancy Kerrigan of Stoneham and Mahlon Bradley of Marblehead (Assistant Team Leader).

Luge: Jon Edwards of South Weymouth and Erin Warren of Somerville.

Bobsled: Jim Herberich of Winchester.

Men's 5,000 meter short track relay: Eric Flaim of Pembroke.

Women's 3,000 meter short track relay: Karen Cashman of Quincy.

Hockey: Tim Taylor of Natick (Head Coach), Jim Campbell of Westborough, Ted Crowley of Concord, Peter Laviolette of Franklin, Jeff Lazaro of Waltham, John Lilley of Wakefield, David Sacco of Medford, and Garth Snow of Wrentham.

### PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE: A CONFUSED POLICY

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, one of the special friends that I have made since I came to Washington is a true patriot who has served his country long and well—Lt. Gen. Edward L. Rowny. Ed Rowny has distinguished himself in every assignment he has undertaken.

As a military man, his career was nothing short of superb. As deputy chairman of NATO's military committee he earned the respect of everyone who observed his work. As an arms control negotiator, Ambassador Rowny handled every sensitive aspect in a manner that served well the hopes for peace in the world.

Madam President, Ambassador Rowny was present at the Wehrkunde Conference in Munich in early February. He told friends later that the new Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, "foreshadowed the administration's stiffening policy on Bosnia."

Upon his return, Ambassador Rowny penned an article for the *Wall Street Journal* which should be must reading for all Senators. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE: A CONFUSED POLICY (By Ambassador Edward L. Rowny)

My recent conversations with European and Russian policymakers reveal they are confused over how to carry out President Clinton's Partnership for Peace. In the rush to cobble together a road map for the future of NATO, it is understandable that the Clinton Administration was not able to develop a coherent or sufficiently detailed plan for policymakers to follow.

Our allies, grateful for President Clinton's commitment to NATO, and desirous of assuring that NATO has a viable future, adopted a vague and painless proposal to which all could quickly agree. Central European leaders, unhappy with the proposal, were pressured into adopting it in the hope that they could turn it to their advantage. Eastern European leaders, jubilant that the proposal does not appear to be a policy of neo-containment, likewise hope to turn its implementation to their advantage. The Clinton Administration, still reluctant to get deeply involved in external affairs, appears content to have checked off this square with a sketchy outline and let nature take its course. As a result, Western European offi-

cials are unclear about the ultimate objectives of Partnership for Peace. Central European officials, stunned with their shabby treatment because the West failed to make a distinction between them and Eastern Europe, are content to pocket what they can in the hopes for getting more later. Both groups naturally want to see the plan carried out to suit themselves. Eastern European policymakers, calculating that the initial steps implementing the plan are working to their advantage, are content with them. To regain credibility and demonstrate leadership, the Clinton Administration should act quickly to provide a more detailed plan which will clear up the confusion and uncertainty.

All would agree that the ultimate goal of Partnership for Peace is to provide for security and stability in Central and Eastern Europe. But by failing to establish priorities, the uncharted course will either allow the proposal to continue to flounder, or worse, cause it to fail completely. Meanwhile, the Eastern European states will attempt to shape events so as to continue to gain unilateral advantage.

I believe that the Clinton Administration should act now and promise the Central European states of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech and Slovak Republics early membership into NATO. These states share Western cultural values and yearn to be fully reunited with Europe from which they were snatched by the Soviets. They have demonstrated courage in breaking away from totalitarian communist regimes and have shown a willingness to undergo hardships in transforming their Marxist economies. They have moved a long way in the last three years along the road to democratic capitalism. As soon as they demonstrate that they will be able to shoulder the burdens of membership, they should join NATO as full partners.

At the same time, Eastern European nations—Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and the Baltics—should be given more support and encouragement to adopt democratic and economic reforms. There should be no promise of early, or even eventual, membership in NATO. Rather, they should be led to understand that it is in their own interests to embrace democracy and market economics as ways of promoting their own security and prosperity.

In talking to Russian and Ukrainian leaders, I am convinced that drawing Central Europe into the NATO sphere will not undermine Yeltsin's efforts to seek reforms. Thoughtful leaders realize that NATO was—and will continue to be—a purely defensive alliance which threatens no one. Western leaders need to reiterate this point and drive it home so that Yeltsin's opposition, such as Zhironovsky, the military, and the successors to the KGB, are exposed as being paranoid. They can then be prevented from capitalizing on the instabilities resulting from Russia's experiments with democracy. Yeltsin can then show Russian citizens and the world that these anti-reformers undermine Russian stability and prevent economic growth.

The United States and its Western European allies, whose resources are already stretched thin, should concentrate on assisting Central Europe to become full members of NATO. This will provide the West with a hedge against a resurgence of a militant Russia. It will also promote stability in Europe.

At the same time, the West should redouble its efforts to help Eastern Europe reform.

We should continue military contacts between the states of NATO and Eastern Europe. But the principal elements of assistance should be non-military, such as cultural exchanges and training leaders in skills necessary for democracy and economic health. When IMF conditions are met, larger doses of financial aid should be offered. We should also assist Eastern Europe in transforming their industries from a military to a civilian base, to scrap their missiles more rapidly, and to place their growing stockpiles of plutonium and weapons grade uranium under strict surveillance and control.

I am not one who shares the notion that promoting democracy and market economics in Eastern Europe is a hopeless endeavor. It is true that these states lag behind Central Europe in such efforts and have a long historical legacy to overcome. But there is nothing inherent in the Russian character which prevents them from moving toward Western ideas and standards. The rapid fall of the Communist Party and renunciation of Marxist economics are cases in point. Further encouragement and investment in hastening reforms in Eastern Europe can pay large dividends. We should not repeat the mistake we made in the early 1930s in failing to support the Weimar Republic. If we were to consider Russia—as we then considered Germany—a pariah state, we could well create a climate for the emergence of a totalitarian regime.

There is another reason why membership of the Central European states in NATO makes sense and membership for Eastern Europe does not. Central European states are largely homogeneous ethnic entities. Western NATO allies need not worry about preserving internal stability in Central Europe. On the other hand, there are reasons to worry about the stability of Eastern Europe. A quarter of the Russian population lives beyond its current borders. Today there are armed conflicts in Georgia, Armenia, Moldova, and other former republics of the Soviet Union. Ukraine, despite recent security guarantees, remains suspicious of Russia in view of the boasts by Russian hardliners that Ukraine will be annexed. We can therefore expect considerable unrest, resulting in conflict and bloodshed, in Russia and its eastern and southern neighbors. These conflicts are not matters in which an expanded NATO should become involved. In fact, when the Eastern European states no longer have ethnic conflicts, and when they become democracies with operating market economies, they will no longer pose a potential threat to others. NATO can then be declared a full success, and like an old soldier, quietly fade away.

As for providing security guarantees to Eastern Europe, the United States can enter into agreements with Russia and Belarus similar to those reportedly offered recently to Ukraine. As part of the deal to get Ukraine to give up its nuclear weapons to Russia, the United States and Russia recognized the current Russian-Ukrainian boundaries. The United States also promised to support any actions that the United Nations decides are necessary to assure Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In sum, the Clinton Administration should quickly announce its specific plans to implement Partnership for Peace. Inaction and drift will only encourage further confusion and invite chaos. The key to success is the leadership of the United States. It should press for membership of the Central European states into NATO. The Clinton Administration's failure to take timely action will result in a missed opportunity to enhance

stability in Central and Eastern Europe and support reforms in Russia.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 93

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of August 2, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq), then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. U.S. persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Security Resolution No. 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. member states temporarily to transfer to a U.N. escrow account \$200 million apiece in Iraqi oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq. These funds finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a non-partisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds will also fund the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which will handle claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the member states that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No member state is required to fund more than half of the total contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders Nos. 12724 and 12817. The report covers events from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994.

1. During the reporting period, there were technical amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations relating to notification of transfers into blocked accounts and registration of persons holding blocked property, 58 Fed. Reg. 47643 (September 10, 1993). A copy of the amendments is attached for reference.

2. Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. These are intended to deter future activities in violation of the sanctions. Additional civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi Sanctions Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. Three penalties totaling nearly \$54,000 were collected from three banks for violation of the prohibitions against funds transfers to Iraq, and noncompliance with reporting requirements and an Office of Foreign Assets Control directive license.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to the Office of Foreign Assets Control's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Iraq.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12817 implementing United Nations Se-

curity Council Resolution No. 778, on October 26, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order. On July 20, 1993, following payments by the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Denmark of, respectively \$40,589,419.00 and \$674,360.00, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778 Escrow Account, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$41,263,779.00 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-controlled account. Similarly, on August 2, 1993, following the payment of \$1,765,138.33 by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$1,765,138.33 to the United Nations-controlled account; on September 11, 1993, following payments of \$1,547,054.35 by the Government of Canada, \$276,000.00 by the Government of Greece, \$3,196,897.72 from the Commission of the European Community, and \$1,006,614.89 from the Government of Denmark, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$6,026,566.96 to the United Nations-controlled account; and on December 15, 1993, following payments of \$5,223,880.60 by the Government of the United Kingdom, \$621,426.80 by the Government of Germany, and \$1,219,941.98 from the Government of the Netherlands, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$7,065,249.38 to the United Nations-controlled account. Total transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 have amounted to \$107,613,270.99 of the \$200 million for which the United States is potentially obligated, on a matching basis, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778.

5. Since the last report, there have been developments in one case. In *Campia et al. v. Newcomb et al.*, a settlement was entered into by the parties addressing payment of back rent to the landlord and return to the landlord of premises leased by the Matrix Churchill Corporation. To implement the settlement, certain blocked property owned by Matrix Churchill was sold, with the proceeds placed in a blocked account. Matrix Churchill's remaining property and records were placed in secure storage.

6. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 444 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Since my last report, 53 specific licenses have been issued. Licenses

were issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, for legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, and food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq, and the protection of pre-existent intellectual property rights in Iraq.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6 month period from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported at about \$3.1 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs, the Bureau of International Organizations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

8. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's invasion and illegal occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime, despite international will, has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. Nonetheless, we see a pattern of defiance: repeated public claims to Kuwait, sponsorship of terrorism, incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors, and ongoing widespread human rights violations, among other things. The U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continued to violate basic human rights by repressing the Iraqi civilian population

and depriving it of humanitarian assistance. For more than 2 years, Baghdad has maintained a complete blockade of food, fuel, and medicine on northern Iraq. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" Kurdish, Turcoman, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq continues to launch artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, and its efforts to drain the southern marshes have forced thousands to flee to neighboring States.

In 1991, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolutions 706 and 712 that permit Iraq to sell up to \$1.6 billion of oil under U.N. auspices to fund the provision of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies to the people of Iraq. Under the U.N. resolutions, the equitable distribution within Iraq of this assistance would be supervised and monitored by the United Nations. The Iraqi regime so far has refused to accept these resolutions and has thereby chosen to perpetuate the suffering of its civilian population. In October 1993, the Iraqi government informed the United Nations that it would not implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter Iraq from threatening peace and stability in the region, and I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1994.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:14 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1789. An act to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-379. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"SENATE RESOLUTION No. 313

"Whereas, It has long been customary for kings and republics, governments of all

kinds, to issue medals commemorating events or faithful service. Presently the United States issues a multitude of medals and ribbons for a broad scope of services and actions, both to individuals and to all members of a command; and

"Whereas, Members of the armed forces are issued campaign medals and ribbons indicating participation in certain actions, bravery, or honorable service. These are to denote a person's accomplishments. Now, the question of a medal that will also identify heritage has been raised. The establishment of a National Armed Forces Medal for United States military veterans would continue a proud tradition from one generation to the next; and

"Whereas, It has been suggested that a separate ribbon for each American effort of one's blood lineage be worn with one universal medal. Thus, on quick observation, it would be apparent by the line of ribbons whether the wearer had forebears in service during the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the American Indian Wars, the Civil War, or other events in a certain 100-year time frame; and

"Whereas, Other periods of war service would also be included after the 100-year period. The Spanish-American War, 1898 to 1902, would be included in 1998, and World War I, World War II, and succeeding conflicts, after each had passed the century mark; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate, That this legislative body memorialize the Congress of the United States to establish a National Armed Forces Medal for United States military veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation."

POM-380. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 407

"Whereas, a joint National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and U.S. Department of Defense study has proposed the construction of a \$3.2 billion state-of-the-art subsonic and transonic wind tunnel complex with all necessary operational support facilities, such project to be known as the National Wind Tunnel Complex (NWTC); and

"Whereas, although such worthy project has yet to be funded, technical and cost criteria for the project have been established and a process begun to select a site for the proposed NWTC; and

"Whereas, if approved, the NWTC would establish a capability for advanced aeronautical development that will strengthen the national security of the United States in two important ways; and

"Whereas, the NWTC would provide a development capability second to none in the world for advanced military aircraft, and more importantly, it would enable our commercial aircraft developers to compete more effectively in the world market, thereby strengthening our economic national security; and

"Whereas, the NWTC would require some 1,200 experienced construction workers to build the facility and at least 200 skilled management and engineering personnel to operate the facility; and

"Whereas, the premier site in this nation for the new development of wind tunnels is

the U.S. Air Force's Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), located in southern Coffee County and neighboring Franklin County in Middle Tennessee; and

"Whereas, AEDC houses testing grounds for jet engines and space systems, including wind tunnels used to gauge equipment strength and durability on 40,000 acres managed by the U.S. Air Force and operated by private contractors; and

"Whereas, AEDC has a total work force of nearly 4,000, including roughly 500 Air Force and Defense Department civilian employees; and

"Whereas, the existing support infrastructure and experienced development testers at AEDC would reduce the initial cost and operational risk of the NWTC, and there are opportunities for commercial-military partnerships in dual-use technologies which are made possible only by the co-location and joint use of civilian and military facilities; and

"Whereas, U.S. Senator Jim Sasser, U.S. Senator Harlan Mathews and U.S. Congressman Jim Cooper have so astutely stated: 'This potential investment is far too critical to our nation's economic and defense future not to be placed in a location in which low life-cycle cost, high operating efficiencies, ideal environment conditions and an abundance of space for future expansion can maximize its effectiveness'; and

"Whereas, the AEDC site provides an ideal location for the NWTC because of the abundance of land, water for cooling the vast machinery used to operate the test facilities, low-cost electricity, and its relative isolation from other development; and

"Whereas, the AEDC installation is buffered from surrounding communities by thousands of forested acres, and would remain so even with further expansion in the future; and

"Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority has the current generating capacity to meet the electrical needs of the NWTC with no impact on current customers or restrictions on testing operations; a 4,000-acre cooling-water reservoir is already in place; and

"Whereas, finally, the entire southern Middle Tennessee area benefits from relatively low construction costs, a workforce already experienced in production development testing, and the synergism that would be created by co-locating this facility with those testing and research facilities already in the area; and

"Whereas, the NWTC will provide our nation with a world-class developmental test capability which will support military and commercial aeronautical requirements well into the next century; and

"Whereas, the siting of NWTC at AEDC would ensure AEDC's long-term viability as a national testing and research center; and

"Whereas, the members of this General Assembly are confident that the site selection process for NWTC will clearly demonstrate that AEDC is by far the best site in the nation for the complex; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That this General Assembly hereby memorializes the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to locate the proposed National Wind Tunnel Complex (NWTC) at the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC) in Middle Tennessee, because the AEDC installation best serves the aeronautical development needs of this nation, and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House is hereby directed to transmit en-

rolled copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States; the U.S. Secretary of Defense; the Administrator for NASA, the Speaker and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives; the President and Secretary of the U.S. Senate; and to each member of the Tennessee delegation to the U.S. Congress."

POM-381. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York relative to Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-382. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### "SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 369

"Whereas, The President of the United States has lifted the trade embargo with Vietnam by Executive Order. This embargo was imposed on North Vietnam in 1964 and on the entire country in 1975 after the communist forces succeeded in capturing South Vietnam. The embargo was enforced not only because this communist government had waged a bitter and painful war against the United States, but also because some of our citizens may still be missing in that country; and

"Whereas, The MIA issue is a painful controversy in this nation, one that will not be resolved until we have the fullest possible accounting of the nearly 2,300 Americans who remain missing and unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. Seventy-two of these people are from Michigan, brave and patriotic citizens who cannot be forgotten; and

"Whereas, Restoring this embargo will maintain pressure on the government of Vietnam to do everything possible to find the missing Americans. On behalf of the MIAs, their loved ones, and all veterans, we request the President to restore the trade embargo on Vietnam; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the President of the United States to reconsider lifting the trade embargo with Vietnam; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation."

POM-383. A concurrent resolution from the Legislature of the State of Texas relative to State Tidelands Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-384. A concurrent resolution from the Legislature of the State of Texas relative to polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-385. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 122

"Whereas, The United States Supreme Court has ruled in a 5-4 decision that popular legislative assemblies' attempts to curtail those acts that are an affront to the American people by protecting national symbols through local legislation may be unconstitutional if they go beyond the fine-line of the First Amendment; and

"Whereas, The desecration of national symbols through acts which are beyond the free speech essentials of our laws that allow the expression of diverse ideas or opposition to national policy that is political in nature, should be defined in law in order to protect against offensive acts which may incite or encourage violence or counterproductive activity of other citizens; and

"Whereas, Veterans' groups, expressing the sentiment of our people, have called for action to ban the desecration of the American flag. Indeed, to ignore the effect of this decision would be an affront to everyone who has been committed to the ideals of our nation in times of war and in times of peace; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature hereby memorialize the United States Congress to pass an amendment to the United States Constitution to prohibit the desecration of the American flag; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation."

POM-386. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### "HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 8

"Whereas, Legal injustice and discrimination on the basis of gender have long existed; and

"Whereas, The citizens of West Virginia clearly support an end to discrimination on the basis of gender through an amendment to the Constitution of this nation, as the United States has previously renounced slavery, racial discrimination, and denial of the right to vote on the basis of race and gender; and

"Whereas, Congress in 1972 proposed a federal Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution to provide for equality of the law regardless of gender, which was narrowly defeated in 1982; and

"Whereas, The West Virginia House of Delegates prefers that each state ratify the federal Equal Rights Amendment to achieve a uniform national policy; and

"Whereas, The Equal Rights Amendment provides that gender should not be a factor in determining the legal rights of men and women and thereby recognizes the fundamental dignity, individuality, and worth of each human being; and

"Whereas, The West Virginia House of Delegates again stands ready to ratify a federal Equal Rights Amendment when approved by Congress for state ratification; therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates: That the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to propose to the several states an amendment to the Constitution of the United States stating that all men and women are equal under the law; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from West Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

POM-387. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New York, New York relative to AIDS education and prevention; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1224. A bill to prohibit an agency, or entity, that receives Federal assistance and is involved in adoption or foster care programs from delaying or denying the placement of a child based on the race, color, or national origin of the child or adoptive or foster parent or parents involved, and for other purposes.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. REID, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1887. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Maria Manzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. REID, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1887. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I am pleased today to introduce the National Highway System Designation Act of 1994. I am joined by Senators MOYNIHAN, WARNER, DURENBERGER, LAUTENBERG, WOFFORD, and REID.

Madam President, I first want to congratulate Department of Transportation Secretary Federico Peña and Federal Highway Administrator Rodney Slater for all of their hard work in developing the National Highway System or NHS. This map is the culmination of many months of consultation and discussion with Federal, State and local officials.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 requires congressional approval of the National Highway System by September 30, 1995. I am happy to tell my colleagues that as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I am committed to begin work on this bill this year.

#### INTERSTATE SYSTEM

In 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower initiated the construction of one of this Nation's largest public works

projects—the Interstate System. As when Jefferson made the Louisiana Purchase or when Seward and Lincoln bought Alaska, this turned out to be one of the wisest investments in American history. The Interstate System has served to unite and connect every region of this country.

The Interstate System has been the catalyst behind the growth and expansion of the U.S. economy. While the Interstate is finally nearing completion—40 years and \$130 billion later—the economic importance of a well-maintained, interconnected system of highways continues.

In 1991, Congress recognized this by passing the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act; a law later known as ISTEA. ISTEA marked a significant change in transportation policy by emphasizing flexibility, planning, and strategic investing. ISTEA has also shifted this country out of the Interstate era and into the National Highway System era.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The NHS is a network of over 159,000 miles—only 4 percent of the nearly 4 million miles of our public roads. The NHS will carry over 40 percent of the highway traffic and carry over 70 percent of commercial truck traffic. By identifying the NHS routes, States will be able to better target their future investments to address the safety and efficiency of our highways.

These are the arteries of American commerce; they connect major population centers, border crossings, ports, and airports.

In the spirit of ISTEA, the National Highway System reflects an emphasis on intermodal connectivity. Making sure all our various transportation components are connected. A seamless transportation network that encompasses all modes of transportation that will enhance our economic competitiveness in an increasingly global economy.

For western States, such as my home State of Montana, the National Highway System is vital. Highways are critical to the economy and way of life in the West. Highways are virtually the only significant source of transportation, sometimes a few buses, some air service, but the main transportation system is highways. Highways are also a key to travel and tourism. Many tourists will use some portion of the NHS in the future. By linking population centers with national parks and other tourist attractions, the NHS can contribute to the development of areas not currently served by the Interstate.

In particular, I commend Secretary Peña and Federal Highway Administrator Slater for recognizing the importance of considering the legitimate transportation needs of every region of this country—both urban and rural.

For my home State of Montana, for instance, this proposal represents a

vast improvement over a plan that was put forward by the Bush administration. That proposal would have made it virtually impossible for large and sparsely populated States to maintain their existing road networks. And it would have amounted to an economic death sentence to many rural communities in my State and other sparsely populated areas.

But the Clinton administration plan—and the bill I am introducing today—would treat States like Montana fairly. This new map is good news for a number of Montana communities—places like Lewistown, Thompson Falls, Circle, Sidney, Jordan, Broadus, Miles City, Roundup, and Malta—that would have been left in virtual isolation under the previous proposal.

#### RELATION TO NAFTA

The NHS also has broad and important implications for American trade policy. The passage of the North American Free-Trade Agreement will spur future growth in trade between the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

The NHS not only helps to link all three countries, it enables States to develop transportation corridors for an integrated system of roads to meet increases in commercial vehicle use.

Almost 80 percent of the freight moving between the United States and Mexico moves by truck. Almost 60 percent of the freight between the United States and Canada moves by truck. Improving and maintaining the NHS within these trade corridors will further facilitate this trade.

#### ALLEVIATE CONGESTION

Making the necessary improvements to existing roadways will alleviate much of the traffic congestion in this country. We see this in the Washington area today—the large number of potholes in the roads has slowed and snarled traffic, thereby increasing not only the time spent on the road, but also increasing vehicle emissions. Focusing future investments on the NHS routes can help alleviate the increasing congestion problems in urban areas.

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The declaration of policy in ISTEA states “It is the policy of the United States to develop a National Intermodal Transportation System that is economically efficient and environmentally sound, provides the foundation for the Nation to compete in the global economy, and will move people and goods in an energy efficient manner.”

The National Highway System will serve as the backbone for such a system. The Department of Transportation is in the process of formulating the National Transportation System with the cooperation of State and local officials. I applaud the Department's efforts.

While I reserve judgment on the final NTS product, I do feel it is important

to have an intermodal emphasis to future transportation policies. This Nation cannot afford to view its transportation system as a collection of individual modes. An integrated approach to planning and investments is in our national interest.

#### CONCLUSION

Madam President, I have outlined the purposes and goals of the NHS. Let me now alert my colleagues to my intentions in moving this bill. The Environment and Public Works Committee will hold hearings this spring on the NHS and transportation policies in general.

As I mentioned earlier, the deadline for congressional action on the NHS is September 30, 1995. While I intend to take action on this bill this year—and I underline this year—I must warn Members that this is not an opportunity to reopen ISTEA.

I know that Members have special highway demonstration projects that are important to them. Let me be firm in saying that Senate consideration of the NHS bill will not be an avenue to add new demonstration projects. I encourage Members to restrain themselves from requesting demonstration projects.

With the difficulty Congress continues to face with fully funding ISTEA, I believe the Senate should continue its tradition of passing highway bills that are free of demonstration projects.

In order for the NHS to be approved this year, it must remain a clean bill—that is, free from extraneous and controversial items. I look forward to working with Members of the Senate and with Chairman NORM MINETA in the House to pass an NHS bill that will help lead American transportation policy and American competitiveness into the next century.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1887

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Highway System Designation Act of 1994”.

#### SEC. 2. NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION.

Section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The most recent National Highway System as submitted by the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to this section is hereby designated to be the National Highway System.

“(2) MODIFICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State, the Secretary may—

“(i) add a new route segment to the National Highway System, including a new intermodal connection; or

"(ii) delete a then existing route segment and any connection to the route segment, if the total mileage of the National Highway System (including any route segment or connection proposed to be added under this subparagraph) does not exceed 165,000 miles (265,542 kilometers.)"

"(B) PROCEDURES FOR CHANGES REQUESTED BY STATES.—Each State that makes a request for a change in the National Highway System pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall establish that each change in a route segment or connection referred to in such subparagraph has been identified by the State, in cooperation with local officials, pursuant to applicable transportation planning activities for metropolitan areas carried out under section 134 and statewide planning processes carried out under section 135.

"(3) APPROVAL BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may approve a request made by a State for a change in the National Highway System pursuant to paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that the change—

"(A) meets the criteria established for the National Highway System under this title; and

"(B) enhances the national transportation characteristics of the National Highway System."

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I am pleased to join with Chairman BAUCUS and other colleagues to introduce legislation to designate the National Highway System.

The National Highway System is the cornerstone of the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act [ISTEA] to ensure that our rail, air, and surface transportation network perform to maximum efficiency to move goods and people across the country.

Through the designation of the NHS, we reaffirm the direct Federal responsibility to maintain essential elements of a core network of our interstate system, plus strategic defense highways, and other primary routes.

While the hallmark of ISTEA was its flexibility for States to address their most pressing priorities, the NHS provides the assurance that a quality transportation system will be maintained to assist the flow of commerce between States and into international markets.

I am also committed to developing an efficient, modern, and safe National Highway System because I believe it should be the first of our systems to benefit from the application of new and emerging technologies. The Intelligent Vehicle Highway System or the so-called smart highways presents a good example of emerging technologies with great potential for improving highway safety and efficiency.

In Virginia, the twin problems of congestion and safety in major urban/suburban areas have been the focus of our transportation policy for some time. Interstate highways approach complete gridlock during peak travel periods with the result that commuters cannot get to work and interstate commerce is delayed. That translates into reduced productivity and wasted time and money.

Throughout my service on the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have been concerned about the safety of our surface transportation system for the traveling public.

While we have experienced a decrease in highway fatalities in recent years because of seatbelt and speed limit laws, both of which I have supported, the number of highway-related casualties each year is still far too high. More than 40,000 persons are killed and another 5 million persons injured each year in traffic accidents.

The allocation of resources to bring IVHS technologies to the National Highway System offers a tremendous opportunity to improve mobility, enhance safety, and reduce congestion through electronics, communications, and control technologies.

I believe the Congress must move promptly to designate the National Highway System so that States can begin to plan effectively to dedicate transportation dollars to these routes.

I also believe that this legislation should not become a new reauthorization for our Nation's surface transportation programs.

Madam President, If the Congress can keep this legislation focused on its purpose and address limited and valid technical amendments to ISTEA, then we have a good chance for success this year.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 549

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 549, a bill to provide for the minting and circulation of one-dollar coins.

S. 1149

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1149, a bill to establish in the Department of the Interior the Office of Indian Women and Families, and for other purposes.

S. 1288

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1288, a bill to provide for the coordination and implementation of a national aquaculture policy for the private sector by the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish an aquaculture commercialization research program, and for other purposes.

S. 1329

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1329, a bill to provide for an investigation of the whereabouts of the United States citizens and others who have been missing from Cyprus since 1974.

S. 1359

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1359, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to require the domestic production of food stamp coupons.

S. 1485

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1485, a bill to extend certain satellite carrier compulsory licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 1614

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 1614, a bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the National Lunch Act to promote healthy eating habits for children and to extend certain authorities contained in such acts through fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] were added as cosponsors of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the rules regarding subchapter S corporations.

S. 1858

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1858, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to make Super 301 permanent.

S. 1884

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of S. 1884, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform asylum procedures, to strengthen criminal penalties for the smuggling of aliens, and to reform other procedures to control illegal immigration to the United States.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 163

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 163, a joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1994, as "National Agricultural Day."

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of the President's actions to reduce the trade imbalance with Japan.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 182

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 182, a resolution entitled "A Call for Humanitarian Assistance to the Pontian Greeks."

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold a full committee hearing to examine the impact of health care reform on the small business sector. The hearing will be held on Thursday, March 10, 1994, at 9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please call John Ball, staff director of the Small Business Committee at 224-5175.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994, at 11 a.m. to mark up draft legislation entitled the "Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 3, 1994, at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed session, to receive testimony from the unified commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements, and the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 1995 and the future years Defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, beginning at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on regulatory consolidation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet today at 10 a.m. to hear testimony on the subject of designing health care benefit packages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 3, 1994, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on the President's fiscal year 1995 budget for the Indian Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994, to hold a hearing on the nominations of Franklin D. Burgess, to be a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Washington, Ancy Haggerty, to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon, Michael J. Davis, to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Minnesota, Daniel T.K. Hurley, to be a U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing to receive testimony and view demonstrations on current and emerging technology which may affect the future operations of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994 at 2:30 p.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on East Asia and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994, at 10:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on U.S. policy toward North Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE, OCEANS AND ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment of the Committee on Foreign Re-

lations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 3, 1994, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on global economic and environmental policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 10 a.m., March 3, 1994, to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 218, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; S. 859, to reduce the restrictions on lands conveyed by deed under the act of June 8, 1926; S. 1233, to resolve the status of certain lands in Arizona that are subject to a claim as a grant of public lands for railroad purposes, and for other purposes; S. 1586, to establish the New Orleans Jazz National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1183, to validate conveyances of certain lands in the State of California that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to the Central Pacific Railway Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## TRIBUTE TO ADVANCE SEED CO.

• Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a company's countless contributions to the community of Louisville, KY. The Advance Seed Co. of Fulton, KY, has helped make the dreams of a Veterans Administration medical center in Louisville come true and the dream continues today.

The Louisville-based medical center leads other centers in a nationwide program named Project Blossom, a horticultural therapy project for veterans which allows for exposure to the outdoors, mental exercise, relaxation, and a chance to nurture living things. With help from Advance Seed Co., the national project became a success in Louisville. Advance Seed has donated more than \$3,000 in seeds to the program. More than 35 centers in 24 states now participate in Project Blossom with 6 million seeds at a retail value over \$57,000 donated nationwide. The extensive effort will benefit over 1,500 patients directly and thousands more indirectly. These numbers continue to grow daily.

Of course, this would hardly be a reality if it were not for the diligent and continuous work of Mr. Jack Simpson. A very active member in the commu-

nity of Fulton, Mr. Simpson is a member of the four Rivers Manufacturing Council, the Fulton County Chamber of Commerce, and other civic organizations. Along with these achievements is his enthusiastic commitment to Advance Seed for the past nineteen years. He is currently chief operating officer of the Advance Seed Co., and he certainly put his best foot forward to make sure that the medical center's wishes were granted.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding Kentucky company and all its valuable members, especially Mr. Simpson. Mr. President, I also ask that an article from a Veterans Administration medical center newsletter be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the VA Connections newsletter]

PROJECT BLOSSOM GROWS AND GROWS AND GROWS \* \* \*

[Note.—As the story goes, Johnny Appleseed traveled around the country planting apple seeds wherever he went. The Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Centers have their own "Johnny Appleseed" in the form of the Advance Seed Company.]

Through the exceptional generosity of a seed company in Fulton, Kentucky, the Louisville VAMC has led Medical Centers across the country in a nationwide horticulture therapy project.

Last summer, the Advance Seed Company donated 2,500 packages of vegetable and flower seeds (valued at over \$3,200) to the Day Treatment Center's Horticulture Therapy Program.

Robert Brown, Sales Administrator for the Advance Seed Company, says his company made the donation to benefit the country's Veterans. "Because they have given so much to us, we felt this would be the least we could do for them," he said.

After their initial donation, the Advance Seed Company (which is the retail distributor of Ferry-Morse Seeds) received such an overwhelming positive response from Veterans and the general community that they decided to take the Project nationwide.

With the help and coordination of the Louisville VAMC's Public Affairs Office and the American Legion, every VAMC with horticulture therapy programs was contacted and offered up to 3,000 packages of seeds—at absolutely no cost.

The response was tremendous.

Project Blossom distributed more than six million seeds nationwide—that's 43,475 individual seed packets—with a retail value of more than \$57,000. Thirty-five Medical Centers in 24 states received seed packets that will ultimately benefit over 1,500 patients directly and thousands more indirectly.

Each facility receiving seed packets was encouraged to use creativity and ingenuity in deciding how they could best use the donation. And, since the massive distribution early this Spring, several Medical Centers have reported back to the Louisville VAMC and the Advance Seed Company regarding their success with Project Blossom.

At the Battle Creek, Michigan, VAMC, for example, the seeds are being grown to produce flowers for the flower beds on hospital grounds and for flower arrangements used at VA functions (such as dances, volunteer luncheons, and patriotic celebrations). Their greenhouse also features a "plant of

the month" that is grown and distributed on the hospital wards, in waiting areas and in day rooms.

Battle Creek patients are taking horticulture therapy one step further by using the flowers in basic flower arranging classes and also by creating a "butterfly garden" complete with hibernation boxes.

Horticulture therapy principles have been around for centuries, but formal horticulture therapy and structured programs are relatively new. Horticulture therapy uses simple gardening techniques to enhance the quality of life for individuals with mental, physical, emotional, development, and/or social problems.

From a medical perspective, researchers are just beginning to look for a psychological or even physiological explanation for the benefits of horticulture therapy. However, on a more obvious level, gardening benefits special populations in the same way it does for the rest of us: physical exercise, the opportunity to be exposed to the outdoors, mental challenges, relaxation when we're tense, and the outlet to nurture living things.

A big "thanks" goes to Robert Brown, who initiated Project Blossom. A great Veterans advocate, Brown is currently the vice-commander of the American Legion—Department of Kentucky, as well as an active member of the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars among others. •

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO JOE MERRITT ON THE OCCASION OF HIS ELECTION TO THE PRESIDENCY OF THE NFDA

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate an outstanding man on the occasion of his election to the presidency of the National Funeral Directors Association [NFDA]. Mr. John C. "Joe" Merritt has been a licensed funeral director and embalmer since 1974, when he received the Mu Sigma Alpha Society award for excellence from the California College of Mortuary Science.

Joe was born and raised on an American Indian reservation. He and his wife Kerry are the parents of two daughters, Brandi, who was a nursing student at the Washington State Intercollegiate School of Nursing before her death as a result of a brain tumor on November 1, 1992, and Bradi, a business student at Washington State University.

Joe and Kerry own and operate Merritt Funeral Home, Langevin-Mussetter Funeral Home, Jones & Jones Funeral Home, and Waterville Funeral Home. Joe is a past president of the Washington State Funeral Directors Association as well as a past president of the State Funeral Insurance Agency. Joe has served NFDA as chairman of the committee for audits of brochures and booklets and as a member of the education affairs steering committee. Additionally, Joe has served as NFDA's secretary, treasurer, and president-elect. Joe's outstanding contributions to NFDA have enabled the association to better serve its members through improved communications and educational programs.

During the upcoming year, Joe hopes to help NFDA establish itself more fully as a flexible, growing, and dynamic leader in the funeral service industry. Finally, Joe believes that NFDA's priorities should mirror those of the truly committed funeral service professional: The consumer first, the profession second, and the individual third.

The National Funeral Directors Association has elected an able and committed leader as their president for 1994. They are fortunate to have such a leader, and I commend Mr. Merritt on his great achievement in becoming president of the National Funeral Directors Association. •

#### HONORING DOMINIC DiFRISCO AND STEFANO CACCIAGUERRA RANGHIERI

• Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, on March 4, 1994, the National Italian-American Foundation will honor my friends Dominic DiFrisko and Consul General Stefano Maria Cacciaguerra Ranghieri at the first Annunzio award luncheon in Chicago. This recognition is indeed an honor—and a well-deserved one.

The NAIF is honoring Dominic DiFrisko and Stefano Cacciaguerra Ranghieri with this award because they have made a real difference in bringing together the Italian-American citizens of Illinois. They serve their community with distinction. NAIF is the major advocate in Washington, DC, for the Nation's 20 million Italian-Americans. Their mission is to help Italian-Americans preserve the values of their heritage and to ensure that the American media and public are aware of the contributions that Italians and their descendants have made to the United States throughout its history. Dominic DiFrisko and Stefano Cacciaguerra Ranghieri are truly representative of these goals and ideals.

Dominic currently represents the esteemed firm of Burson-Marsteller as their senior vice president and director of community and government relations in Chicago. Prior to that, he was an administrative aide to Congressman Frank Annunzio following his work as public relations and sales manager at Alitalia Airlines in Chicago. He is a man who is proud of his Italian heritage which shows in both his professional life and personal endeavors. He has led the community in bridging the gap between people of various ethnic backgrounds, cultural differences, and social diversity.

Dominic has spent many years working on behalf of his community and many other ethnic communities in Chicago. Whether it is as president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans, as a member of the board of directors of the Chicago Center for Peace Studies, as chairman of the

United Negro College Fund Telethon in 1990-91, or as a member of the board of directors of the Chinese-American Service League. Dominic has shown his dedication and commitment to the various communities which serve the Chicago area. Dominic is immersed in the fabric of Chicago's multiethnic community.

Stefano Cacciaguerra Ranghieri has served in the diplomatic service of Italy for over 15 years, and we have been lucky enough to have him in Chicago as the consul general for the past 3 years. The consul general has taken an active role in promoting the Italian cultural heritage of Italian-Americans, and in forging trade and economic links between Italy and Chicago and the Midwest. He is a cofounder of the Italy-Midwest Exchange whose mission is to strengthen the economic and cultural ties between Italy and the Midwest, and to promote the image of contemporary Italy.

The consul general was very involved in the events in Chicago leading up to the 500th anniversary of Columbus's voyage to America. As part of the 1992 Quincentenary Celebration and Beyond, he assisted in the staging of the Living Chess Game from Marostica, Italy, in the Daley Center Plaza. And he brought Frece Tricolori, the Italian Air Force aerobatic team, to the 1992 Chicago Air and Water Show.

I am very pleased that the National Italian American Foundation has chosen to honor Dominic DiFriscio and Stefano Cacciaguerra Ranghieri. Their past national honorees include U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Frank Sinatra, Joe DiMaggio, Lee Iacocca, Liza Minelli, Luciano Pavarotti, and Sophia Loren, and in my view Dominic and the consul general fit in perfectly with this esteemed group. I wish to convey my heartfelt congratulations to them and my sincere thanks for all that they have done.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DANIEL "DANNY" STERN

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a remarkable man, Daniel "Danny" Stern, my constituent and an active member of the Beth Israel Synagogue for over 20 years. He will be given a Distinguished Service Award by the Beth Israel Synagogue in Randallstown, MD. He has earned this award because of his active involvement in his synagogue and the community. A man successful in life, he generously contributes to his community his time and energy.

He has been the club president and vice president of Beth Israel Synagogue. He has served on the Beth Israel board of directors for 8 years and has served as copresident of the Hebrew School PTA with his wife. He has taught bar and bat mitzvah lessons to young students.

In addition to his involvement in his synagogue and with its young people, he has held many regional executive positions within the Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs [FJMC]. Currently, he serves on the executive committee of FJMC. The FJMC is the coordinating body which sets the national policy and service programs for all conservative Jewish synagogues in the United States and Canada.

Mr. Stern gives so much of his community. It is citizens like Mr. Stern who make America the great country that it is. That is why I stand here today to honor him.●

#### CASIMIR PULASKI DAY

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Casimir Pulaski, one of the heroes of the American Revolution. In my great State of Illinois the first Monday in March is known as Casimir Pulaski Day, in honor of his birthday, March 4, 1747. In 1929, Congress designated October 11 to be observed as Pulaski Day.

Born in Warka, Poland, Mr. Pulaski began his career as organizer and leader of the Confederacy of Patriots which fought against Russian aggression and interference. He was exiled from Poland in 1771 after being unjustly accused of attempting to kill the King. He eventually wound up in Paris where his military leadership was recognized by the French royal court who recommended him to Benjamin Franklin, who was seeking volunteers for the American Revolution.

On July 23, 1777, Pulaski arrived in America to serve in General Washington's army not speaking a word of English. Mr. Pulaski proved to be much more than a good officer; he was both an experienced cavalry man and a superior strategist.

This marked the beginning of an extraordinarily decorated career. He played a crucial role in helping America fight for freedom and independence. As soon as Mr. Pulaski took temporary command of Washington's cavalry detachment in September 1777, he successfully saved supplies and Warren's Tavern from British attack.

On September 15, 1777, because of his bravery in the Battle of Brandywine, Congress commissioned Mr. Pulaski brigadier general. On February 25, 1778, he resigned as commander of the cavalry corps and began the formation of the Independent Corps of Light Cavalry and Infantry, which was later known as the Pulaski Legion.

Once the corps was authorized, Brigadier General Pulaski quickly recruited, clothed, and trained the corps in 3 months time, using a good sum of his own money. His corps fought minor skirmishes in Egg Harbor, NJ, and Minising on the Delaware River.

In February 1779, the corps was ordered to the South to join Gen. Ben-

jamin Lincoln's army. The corps helped regain Charleston, SC, and later that year fought the siege of Savannah, GA, alongside the French against the British. It was during this battle where he was fatally wounded as he led the charge against the enemy. He later died aboard the American brig *Wasp* on October 11, 1779 at the age of 32.

Pulaski has been honored in many ways around the United States. There is a monument here in Washington. Brigadier General Pulaski was one of 600 Polish officers that vitally contributed to our fight for freedom.

One of this country's greatest strengths is its ability to draw on the talent of all the people that have arrived on American shores. Casimir Pulaski is a proud example of the contributions of many to the fight for freedom and democracy in the United States.

Today, I honor Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski as an American patriot.●

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1994

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, March 7; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 1:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with Senator HEFLIN recognized for up to 10 minutes; that at 1:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 165, S. 4, the National Competitiveness Act of 1993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS UNTIL 12:30 P.M., MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1994

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:50 p.m., recessed until Monday, March 7, 1994, at 12:30 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 3, 1994:

##### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

JOE SCROGGINS, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 1995, VICE CHRISTOPHER L. KOCH, RESIGNED.

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE AS-

SIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), AND AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 711:

*To be lieutenant general*

*To be a senior member of the military staff committee of the United Nations*

MAJ. GEN. WESLEY K. CLARK, 432-80-5682, U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE, U.S. ARMY FOR A PERIOD OF 4 YEARS, UNDER SECTION 3038, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

ARMY RESERVE

*To be chief*

MAJ. GEN. MAX BARATZ, 330-26-0958, U.S. ARMY.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRALS (LOWER HALF) IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFORE AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD ARNOLD NELSON, 442-40-1464, NAVY.

SUPPLY CORPS

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) DONALD EUGENE HICKMAN, 315-38-3238, U.S. NAVY.  
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID ROSS RUBLE, 240-60-1979, U.S. NAVY.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS ALLAN DAMES, 342-34-4355, U.S. NAVY.

DENTAL CORPS

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM HOWARD SNELL, JR., 059-32-2078, U.S. NAVY.